

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT

### Overview

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
906	84,948,000	919	87,342,000	943	94,675,000	24	7,333,000

### Introduction

The Superior Court of the District of Columbia is unique among the nation's trial courts. It accounts for among the highest number of case filings per capita in the United States (as reported by the National Center for State Courts for several years) as it serves all those residing, visiting, and conducting business in the Nation's Capital as its only trial court. It receives its funding directly from the Federal government and operates in the nation's most visible arena. With the support of 105 judicial officers, including 59 active judges, 22 senior judges, and 24 magistrate judges, the Superior Court is the court of general jurisdiction over virtually all local legal matters. Supported by 805 non-judicial FTEs, the Court operates six major divisions identified below and the Special Operations Division (including the Tax Office), the Domestic Violence Unit, the Crime Victims Compensation Program, and the Office of the Auditor Master. The major divisions are--

- **Civil Division**, which has general jurisdiction over any civil action at law or in equity brought in the District of Columbia, regardless of the amount in controversy, including Small Claims and Landlord and Tenant cases;
- **Criminal Division**, which has jurisdiction over defendants who are charged with criminal offenses under any law applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia;
- **Family Court**, which serves children and families in the District; and is comprised of—
  - **Family Court Operations Division**, which has jurisdiction over the following types of cases: abuse and neglect, juvenile, domestic relations, domestic violence, paternity and support, mental health and retardation, marriage licenses, and adoptions; and
  - **Social Services Division**, which is the juvenile probation system for the District of Columbia and provides information and recommendations to assist the Court in decision-making, court-supervised alternatives to incarceration, and support services to youth within the Court's purview;
- **Probate Division**, which supervises the administration of all decedents' estates, guardianships of minors, conservatorships and guardianships of adults, certain trusts, and assignments for the benefit of creditors;
- **Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division**, which provides a variety of alternative dispute resolution services to assist citizens in resolving their problems without litigation; and

## Caseload and case filings

During FY 2004, 134,767 new cases were filed with the Superior Court. Of the total new filings, 57% were civil cases; 26% were criminal cases; 9% were family cases; 6% were domestic violence cases and the remaining 2% were probate and tax cases. In addition to new case filings, as of October 1 2003, there were 47,498 cases pending. In FY 2004, the Court's caseload management practices resulted in a case clearance rate of 100%, meaning that for every case filed, as case was disposed. Tables 1 and 2 provide Superior Court caseload data.

Table 1  
**District of Columbia Superior Court Caseload**

<u>Fiscal</u> <u>Year</u>	<u>New Cases</u>	<u>Start-of-Year</u> <u>Pending Cases</u>	<u>Total Cases</u>
2000	144,046	49,929	209,329
2001	142,623	51,083	209,181
2002	136,045	55,071	205,770
2003	133,425	56,198	204,417
2004	134,767	47,498	200,521

Note: Columns do not add because total cases include reinstatements and cases at issue.

Table 2  
**District of Columbia Superior Court  
Efficiency Measures  
(Fiscal Year 2004 data)**

	<u>Cases Disposed</u>	<u>Cases Added</u>	<u>Clearance</u> <u>Rate*</u>	<u>Cases Pending</u>		
				<u>01-Oct</u>	<u>30-Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
Civil	75,209	77,134	98%	16,662	18,587	12%
Criminal	48,805	48,834	100%	6,079	6,108	0%
Domestic Violence	10,138	10,133	100%	1,143	1,138	0%
Family	15,314	14,054	109%	15,977	14,717	-8%
Probate	3,101	2,663	116%	7,186	6,748	-6%
Tax	174	205	85%	451	482	7%
<b>Total</b>	152,741	153,023	100%	47,498	47,780	1%

\* Ratio of cases disposed to cases added in a given year. A standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case added.

## **FY 2007 Request**

The D.C. Courts' mission is to protect rights and liberties, uphold and interpret the law, and resolve disputes peacefully, fairly and effectively in the Nation's Capital. To perform the mission and realize their vision of a court that is open to all, trusted by all, and provides justice for all, the Courts have identified 5 strategic issues, which comprise the center of our strategic goals:

- **Strategic Issue 1:** Enhancing the administration of justice;
- **Strategic Issue 2:** Broadening access to justice and service to the public;
- **Strategic Issue 3:** Promoting competence, professionalism and civility;
- **Strategic Issue 4:** Improving Court facilities and technology; and
- **Strategic Issue 5:** Building trust and confidence.

The Superior Court has aligned its FY 2007 request around these five issues.

In FY 2007, the Superior Court requests \$94,675,000 and 943 FTEs, an increase of \$7,333,000 (8%) and 24 FTEs above the FY 2006 Enacted level. The request includes increases to support the following Court goals:

### ***Strategic Issue 1: Enhancing the administration of justice -- \$2,370,000 and 23 FTEs***

The Superior Court's FY 2007 request includes \$2,370,000 and 23 FTEs to address the Courts' strategic issue of enhancing the administration of justice, including \$940,000 and 2 FTEs to enhance services to the mentally retarded; \$619,000 and 12 FTEs to consolidate identities of litigants in the Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS); \$348,000 and 4 FTEs to audit and review probate cases in a more timely manner; \$125,000 and 2 FTEs to enhance the quality of data in the Civil Division; \$104,000 to update the library's collection; \$100,000 to purchase additional wraparound services for youths under supervision; \$78,000 and 2 FTEs to enhance customer service in the Landlord Tenant Branch; and \$56,000 and 1 FTE to enhance monitoring of incapacitated adults.

### ***Strategic Issue 2: Broadening access to justice and service to the public -- \$43,000 and 1 FTE***

The Superior Court's FY 2007 request includes \$43,000 and 1 FTE to address the Courts' strategic issue of broadening access to justice and service to the public by enhancing service to litigants filing appeals.

### ***Strategic Issue 4: Improving Court facilities and technology -- \$70,000***

The Superior Court's FY 2007 request includes \$70,000 to address the Courts' strategic goal of improving court facilities and technology by procuring an automated filing system to store and retrieve approximately 200,000 juror qualification forms each year.

Table 3  
**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT**  
**Budget Authority by Object Class**

	<b>FY 2005 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2006 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2007 Request</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	57,942,000	60,340,000	64,837,000	4,497,000
12 - Benefits	12,402,000	12,923,000	14,368,000	1,445,000
<b>Sub-total Personnel Cost</b>	<b>70,344,000</b>	<b>73,263,000</b>	<b>79,205,000</b>	<b>5,942,000</b>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	280,000	284,000	290,000	6,000
22 - Transportation of Things	9,000	9,000	9,000	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	5,169,000	4,536,000	4,617,000	81,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	484,000	491,000	515,000	24,000
25 - Other Services	7,226,000	7,307,000	8,355,000	1,048,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	795,000	804,000	1,018,000	214,000
31 - Equipment	641,000	648,000	666,000	18,000
<b>Sub-total Non Personnel Cost</b>	<b>14,606,000</b>	<b>14,079,000</b>	<b>15,471,000</b>	<b>1,392,000</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>84,948,000</b>	<b>87,342,000</b>	<b>94,675,000</b>	<b>7,333,000</b>
FTE	906	919	943	24

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT  
JUDGES AND CHAMBERS STAFF**

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
203	20,417,000	203	20,941,000	203	22,093,000	-	1,152,000

The Superior Court of the District of Columbia is the court of general jurisdiction over virtually all local legal matters. The Court is comprised of ten divisions and offices, which provide for all local litigation functions including criminal, civil (e.g., landlord tenant, and small claims), family (including abuse and neglect, juvenile, and domestic relations cases), probate, and tax. In FY 2004, Superior Court judges processed more than 152,000 cases. The 59 judges of the Superior Court rotate to each division on a scheduled basis, with judges in the Family Court serving renewable three or five year terms. Each Superior Court judge has an administrative assistant and a law clerk.

**FY 2007 Request**

In FY 2007, the Courts request \$22,093,000 for Judges and Chambers Staff, an increase of \$1,152,000 (5%) above the FY 2006 Enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 1  
**JUDGES AND CHAMBERS STAFF**  
**Budget Authority by Object Class**

	<b>FY 2005 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2006 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2007 Request</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	17,534,000	18,011,000	18,641,000	630,000
12 - Benefits	2,788,000	2,835,000	3,355,000	520,000
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<b>20,322,000</b>	<b>20,846,000</b>	<b>21,996,000</b>	<b>1,150,000</b>
- Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	5,000	5,000	5,000	
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	49,000	49,000	50,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	41,000	41,000	42,000	1,000
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<b>95,000</b>	<b>95,000</b>	<b>97,000</b>	<b>2,000</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20,417,000</b>	<b>20,941,000</b>	<b>22,093,000</b>	<b>1,152,000</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 2  
**JUDGES AND CHAMBERS STAFF**  
**Detail, Difference FY 2006/2007**

<b>Object Class</b>	<b>Description of Request</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIG	203	18,000	
	Current Positions COLA	203	612,000	
Subtotal				630,000
12 - Benefits	Current Positions WIG	203	5,000	
	Current Positions COLA	203	516,000	
Subtotal				520,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service	Built-in		1,000	1,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		1,000	1,000
31 - Equipment				
<b>Total</b>				<b>1,152,000</b>

# DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT MAGISTRATE JUDGES

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
46	5,403,000	46	5,543,000	46	5,733,000	0	190,000

The Superior Court has 24 Magistrate Judges, 16 of whom are assigned to Family Court matters. Magistrate Judges in the Family Court and the Domestic Violence Unit of the Superior Court are responsible for the following: (1) administering oaths and affirmations and taking acknowledgements; (2) conducting hearings, making findings and entering judgments in connection with questions of child support handled by the Family Court and Domestic Violence Unit, including establishing temporary support obligations and entering default orders; (3) making findings and entering interim and final orders or judgments in other contested or uncontested proceedings in the Family Court and the Domestic Violence Unit, except for jury trials or felony trials; and (4) ordering imprisonment of up to 180 days for contempt.

The nine Magistrate Judges serving in other areas of the Superior Court are responsible for the following: (1) administering oaths and affirmations and taking acknowledgements; (2) determining conditions of release on bond or personal recognizance, or detention pending trial of persons charged with criminal offenses; (3) conducting preliminary examinations and initial probation revocation hearings in all criminal cases to determine if there is probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed and that the accused committed it; and (4) with the consent of the parties involved, making findings and entering final orders or judgments in other contested or uncontested proceedings in the Civil and Criminal Divisions, except for jury trials or felony trials.

Eleven judicial law clerks, eight secretaries, and one paralegal support the 24 Magistrate Judges and eight part-time members of the Commission on Mental Health (2 FTEs).

## **FY 2007 Request**

In FY 2007, the Courts request \$5,733,000 for Magistrate Judges and Staff, an increase of \$190,000 (3%) above the FY 2006 Enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 1  
**MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF**  
**Budget Authority by Object Class**

	<b>FY 2005 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2006 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2007 Request</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	4,344,000	4,457,000	4,609,000	152,000
12 - Benefits	1,043,000	1,070,000	1,106,000	36,000
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<i>5,387,000</i>	<i>5,527,000</i>	<i>5,715,000</i>	<i>188,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	2,000	2,000	2,000	0
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	8,000	8,000	9,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	6,000	6,000	7,000	1,000
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<i>16,000</i>	<i>16,000</i>	<i>18,000</i>	<i>2,000</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,403,000</b>	<b>5,543,000</b>	<b>5,733,000</b>	<b>190,000</b>
<b>FTE</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 2  
**MAGISTRATE JUDGES AND STAFF**  
**Detail, Difference FY 2006/2007**

<b>Object Class</b>	<b>Description of Request</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIG	46	0	
	Current Positions COLA	46	152,000	
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>152,000</b>
12 - Benefits	Current Positions WIG		0	
	Current Positions COLA		36,000	
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>36,000</b>
21 - Travel, Transportation of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Communications & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials				1,000
31 - Equipment				1,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$ 190,000</b>



**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT**

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
10	953,000	10	988,000	22	1,731,000	12	743,000

**Mission Statement**

The Office of the Clerk of the Court manages the day-to-day operations of the Superior Court. The Clerk provides policy guidance, administrative direction, and supervision for ten divisions and offices within the Superior Court; reviews and issues final decisions in employee disciplinary actions and grievances; approves division requests for staff, equipment and other resources; plans and monitors the implementation of court improvement projects; and develops the Superior Court's annual budget. Court divisions and offices under the administrative authority of the Clerk of the Court collectively called the "Operating Divisions" include: Family Court Operations; Family Court Social Services Division; Civil Division; Criminal Division; Probate Division; Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division; Special Operations Division; Domestic Violence Program; Crime Victim's Compensation Program; and the Office of the Auditor-Master.

The Office of the Clerk is staffed by five FTEs including the Clerk of the Court, two Senior Operations Managers, and two administrative support staff. Five dedicated Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS) Facilitators, who are responsible for ensuring that the new automated case management system is implemented in a manner that meets the needs of Superior Court operating divisions, are administratively located in the Clerk of Court's office. The Office of the Clerk of the Court contributes to the Court's strategic goals by providing managerial assistance and support to the operating divisions to ensure that they are providing fair, swift and accessible justice, enhancing public safety, and ensuring public trust and confidence in the justice system.

**Organizational Background**

The Clerk of the Court has management and supervisory responsibility over all ten operating divisions, programs, and their employees. The Clerk of the Court is responsible for ensuring that each division and program processes all cases in a timely manner and provides the judicial officers, citizens of the District of Columbia, and the persons conducting business with the court timely and accurate customer service. The Clerk of the Court delegates to each director the day-to-day responsibility for managing the individual divisions and offices.

## **FY 2007 Request**

For FY 2007 the D.C. Courts request \$1,731,000 for the Office of the Clerk of the Court, an increase of \$743,000 (75%) above the FY 2006 Enacted level. The increase consists of \$619,000 for 12 FTEs to consolidate identities of parties in IJIS; \$42,000 for built-in cost increases; and \$82,000 to fund existing positions.

### ***IJIS Identity Consolidation***

#### ***FTE Request – 12 Deputy Clerks, JS-8, \$619,000***

**Problem Statement.** In FY 2005, after an intensive four year effort, the Superior Court completed implementation of its Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS). IJIS significantly upgraded and enhanced the Court's information management capabilities and established a unified, fully integrated computer information system for case management called "CourtView". CourtView is designed to support data collection and exchange with the court community for all types of cases including family and juvenile, civil, criminal, probate, and tax as well as interface with systems outside the court community including law enforcement, corrections and other District of Columbia and Federal Agencies. Complete accuracy of all identity information for all parties in CourtView is critical. Data entry in the Court's old legacy systems required that each party to a case be entered into the database, regardless of whether that party had been entered previously. Upon conversion of this data to IJIS, tens of thousands of identities now must be evaluated to determine which ones are the same person for consolidation into a single entity. Great care must be taken in consolidating these identities so that an individual with a family case is not confused with another individual with a similar name against whom charges have been filed in a criminal case. This is a tedious process that requires a high skill level, attention to detail and the ability to make discrete judgments regarding available case information. Careful judgment must be exercised when consolidating identities because consolidation is permanent in CourtView. An individual in a criminal case with the same name of another individual in a civil case, if inaccurately consolidated, for example, would wrongfully give the individual in the civil case a criminal record. A dedicated staff of specialists who focus exclusively on identity consolidation is necessary to ensure absolute accuracy in all cases.

**Relationship to Court Mission and Goals.** The requested positions support the Court's strategic goal to enhance the administration of justice (Goal 1.1) and the goal of providing technology that supports efficient and effective case processing, court management, and judicial decision-making (Goal 4.2).

**Relationship to Court Objectives.** The requested positions would positively impact vital identity information throughout the Court as well as for the District and Federal Agencies dependent upon the Court for accurate information by ensuring quality of data and consolidating identities of all parties

**Methodology.** The grade level and salaries for the requested FTEs were classified pursuant to the D.C. Courts' personnel policies.

Expenditure Plan. The positions would be recruited and hired pursuant to the D.C. Courts' existing personnel policies.

Performance Indicators. A performance indicator includes the number of identities that were accurately consolidated and the reduction in the number of errors found.

Table 1  
Clerk of Court  
New Position Requested

Position	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
Deputy Clerk	JS-08	12	499,000	120,000	619,000

Table 2  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT  
Budget Authority by Object Class

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Difference FY 2006/2007
11 - Compensation	764,000	792,000	1,391,000	599,000
12 - Benefits	183,000	190,000	334,000	144,000
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<i>947,000</i>	<i>982,000</i>	<i>1,725,000</i>	<i>743,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	5,000	5,000	5,000	0
31 - Equipment	1,000	1,000	1,000	0
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<i>6,000</i>	<i>6,000</i>	<i>6,000</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>953,000</b>	<b>988,000</b>	<b>1,731,000</b>	<b>743,000</b>
FTE	10	10	22	12

Table 3  
**OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT**  
**Detail, Difference FY 2006/2007**

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2006/2007
11 - Compensation	Deputy Clerk	12	499,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	10	5,000	
	Current Positions COLA	10	29,000	
	To Fully Fund Current Positions	10	66,000	
Subtotal				599,000
12 - Benefits	Deputy Clerk	12	120,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	10	1,000	
	Current Positions COLA	10	7,000	
	To Fully Fund Current Positions	10	16,000	
Subtotal				144,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
<b>Total</b>				<b>743,000</b>

Table 4  
**OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT**  
**Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment**

	2005 Actual	2006 Enacted	2007 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8	1	1	13
JS-9			
JS-10			
JS-11	3	3	2
JS-12			
JS-13	3	3	4
JS-14	2	2	2
JS-15			
CES	1	1	1
Salaries	764,000	792,000	1,391,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>22</b>

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT  
CIVIL DIVISION**

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference</u> <u>FY 2006/2007</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
103	5,895,000	103	6,096,000	107	6,621,000	4	525,000

The Civil Division has jurisdiction over any civil action at law or in equity (excluding family matters) brought in the District of Columbia except where jurisdiction is exclusively vested in the Federal court. The Division is comprised of four branches, described below. The Division's mission is to deliver quality services to all users of the civil case processing system, thereby increasing the public's trust and confidence in the Court. Additionally, the Division supports the decision-making role of the judiciary to facilitate issuance of timely dispositions in civil cases and to continually move toward the goals outlined in the Court's strategic plan.

**Organizational Background**

The Division is comprised of a Director's Office, which has 3 FTEs, and four branches.

1. The Civil Actions Branch receives and processes all new civil cases filed in the District of Columbia where the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000, including cases requesting equitable relief (such as an injunction or temporary restraining order). In FY 2004 there were nearly 12,000 civil actions filed. Responsibilities also include providing procedural information to the public, accurately maintaining the official case file and the storage of all civil cases, physically and electronically. This branch has 36 FTEs.
2. The Quality Review Branch (formerly the Civil Assignment Branch) monitors compliance with time limits imposed by civil delay reduction mandates; processes all types of post-judgment implementation; schedules events in civil actions cases, including landlord tenant and small claims jury cases; handles IJIS-related identity consolidation matters; issues notices; and manages courtroom staffing and operations. This branch has 27 FTEs.
3. The Landlord Tenant Branch processes all actions for the possession of rental property and violations of lease agreements filed by landlords. The Branch handles a caseload of nearly 50,000 filings annually and has 18 FTEs.
4. The Small Claims and Conciliation Branch oversees the processing, scheduling, and adjudication of cases where the amount in controversy is \$5,000 or less. In FY 2004, there were 17,000 small claims cases filed. This branch has 19 FTEs.

### **Divisional Objectives**

- To ensure prompt and efficient processing of all cases filed within its jurisdictional authority and to accurately record all information related to case filings;
- To allow easy access to data related to civil cases in a prompt and accurate manner;
- To provide quality customer service in a prompt, professional, and courteous manner;
- To maintain vital links to the community, local government agencies, and the Bar to address issues of concern to these entities;
- To provide ongoing and continuous evaluation of all work units and processes to ensure maximum efficiency in civil case processing;
- To ensure a capable, ethical, and productive staff through implementation of a systematic program of human resources management and skill development.

### **Workload Restructuring**

During FY 2004 and the first half of FY 2005, the Division actively participated in the design and implementation of the CourtView case management system, also known as the Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS). During the same period, the Division began to address several customer service initiatives through the development of Management Action Plans (MAPs), which tie these initiatives to the Court's five-year Strategic Plan. In addition, the Division expects to reengineer several position functions and to establish more comprehensive staff training, particularly in light of the implementation of IJIS.

### **Workload Data**

As shown in Table 1, below, the Civil Division disposed of over 76,000 cases in fiscal year 2004, including more than 12,000 civil actions; 49,000 landlord tenant cases; and 17,000 small claims cases. Using the ABA Standards Relating to Trial Courts (1992) as the optimal benchmark, the Division has established interim time standards and goals for processing cases and reducing the length of time between filing and final disposition. For example: a performance goal is the resolution of 80% of all civil cases in less than 18 months, see table 2. The Civil Division's caseload and efficiency measures are reflected in Table 1.

Table 1  
**CIVIL DIVISION**  
**Caseload and Efficiency Measures**  
(Fiscal Year 2004 Data)

	<u>Cases</u> <u>Disposed</u>	<u>Cases</u> <u>Added</u>	<u>Clearance</u> <u>Rate*</u>	<u>Cases Pending</u>		
				<u>1-Oct</u>	<u>30-Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
Civil Actions: Civil I	141	82	172%	658	599	-9%
Civil Actions: Civil II	10,758	10,065	107%	9,472	8,779	-7%
Unassigned Civil Actions	1,456	1,673	87%	800	1,004	+26%
Landlord Tenant	46,176	49,109	94%	3,831	6,804	+78%
Small Claims	17,487	16,903	103%	1,471	1,395	-5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>76,018</b>	<b>77,832</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>16,232</b>	<b>18,581</b>	<b>+14%</b>

\* Ratio of cases disposed to cases added in a given year. A standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case filed.

Table 2  
**CIVIL DIVISION**  
**Key Performance Measures**  
(Fiscal Year 2004 Data)

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimate FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Input	Number of cases filed	Court reports	77,832	70,000	71,050	72,100
Output	Number of cases disposed	Civil Case Processing System	76,018	69,000	70,035	71,085
Outcome	Cases disposed in < 18 months*	Court's Monthly Statistical Report	75%	78%	79%	80%

\* This figure represents Civil Actions and does not include Landlord Tenant and Small Claims cases, which are generally disposed of within 12 months of filing.

### **FY 2007 Request**

In FY 2007, the Courts request \$6,621,000 for the Civil Division, an increase of \$525,000 (8.6%) above the FY 2006 Enacted level. The requested increase consists of \$78,000 and two FTEs to enhance service in the Landlord Tenant Branch; \$125,000 for two FTEs to perform quality reviews; and \$322,000 for built-in increases. Additional resources are needed to adequately manage the demands placed upon the Division's operating branches through the caseload demands, the additional work mandated by IJIS and to provide a satisfactory level of service to litigants.

***Enhancing Service in the Landlord Tenant Branch, \$78,000***

***FTE Request – One File Clerk, JS-04, \$35,000***

***One Deputy Clerk, JS-06, \$43,000***

**Problem Statement.** To attain 100% accuracy, which is critical when issuing orders to evict families from their homes, and to provide quality customer service in the Superior Court's highest volume court, the Landlord Tenant Branch requires additional staff. In 2004, 49,109 landlord tenant cases were filed and 8,899 eviction orders were issued, a rate of about 37 per day.

Orders to evict families from their homes must be accurate 100% of the time. The repercussions of any wrongful eviction are devastating to tenants, landlords, and the Court. Current staffing levels are inadequate to perform comprehensive case reviews, which should take 10 minutes. The average review time is 5 minutes, which poses significant risk for error. To reduce the risk of wrongful eviction, the Court has, on occasion, limited the number of orders issued per day; however, this action impairs landlords' rights to take possession of their property. The implementation of IJIS has increased the duties of the deputy clerks, who must now manage case activity and be accountable for receipting of cash and checks every time pleadings are filed or copies of court documents are requested. These new demands on staff time and skills have sharply increased the functions of the deputy clerk positions. The requested deputy clerk position would be exclusively dedicated to reviewing eviction orders and would, thereby, enhance accountability.

The Landlord Tenant Branch file room maintains documents on the nearly 50,000 cases filed each year, the most of any branch in the Superior Court. In addition to the initial filing, each case has additional filings until the case is closed. Keeping these documents organized is an incredible challenge to the file room staff, who must also fulfill requests at customer service windows by the public to review cases. These staff members are also responsible for scanning pleadings into CourtView. In addition, they process daily 200-300 Trans-Lux forms, the new form to calculate rent owed, which is very time-consuming, as it must be processed and mailed to tenants within 24 hours. Additional clerical help is needed largely due to the increased workload caused by the need to scan every document filed. The Civil Division maintains the highest volume of filings of any division of the Court. The decision to scan all these pleadings with the goal of becoming a fully electronic, paperless court has added considerable time to the 'front end' case processing.

**Relationship to Court Mission and Goals.** The requested positions support the Courts' strategic goal to enhance the administration of justice, particularly, Goal 1.1 to administer justice promptly and effectively.

**Relationship to Divisional Objectives.** The requested positions would impact divisional objectives by increasing the Division's capacity to process and receipt cases, and digitally scan all documents, especially judgments.

**Methodology.** The grade level and salary for the requested FTEs were classified pursuant to the D.C. Courts' personnel policies.



Expenditure Plan. The positions would be recruited and hired pursuant to the D.C. Courts' personnel policies.

***Enhancing Data Quality, \$125,000***

***FTE Request – Two Quality Review Specialists, JS-10, \$125,000***

Problem Statement. To meet requirements for data quality, which have become critical with the implementation of IJIS, two quality review specialists are requested. IJIS, or CourtView, have brought a significant new responsibility to the Civil Division: ensuring quality of data. Two new positions, Quality Review Specialists, in addition to the existing branch staff, are needed to effect the necessary quality review of the work of the Division.

The quality of data has become critical; all data entry must consistently and accurately reflect the activity that has occurred. As the Court moves away from handwritten entries directly onto case jackets and data entry becomes decentralized, a single point of quality review is necessary. To this end, the Civil Assignment Branch has been reorganized to become the Civil Quality Review Branch.

Data entered into CourtView must be consistent. Formerly, the Calendar Coordinator was only capable of reviewing a sample of the 10,000 Civil Actions cases filed each year. Now IJIS mandates review of a sample of the 75,000 cases filed per year throughout the Division. This Division-wide review will be the focus of Quality Review Specialists. The Quality Review Specialists will assist the Calendar Coordinator with reviewing approximately 450 case files each week for proper annotations, for accuracy of in-court hearing results vis-à-vis CourtView docket entries and for identifying bar codes and suitability for scanning. Any errors will be accounted for and staff will be re-trained as necessary.

There are also new, unanticipated duties that CourtView's case processing has imposed on the Division: the number of offices and individuals who are able to schedule cases has increased. The Quality Review Specialist will monitor operations of all of these offices within branches, courtrooms, and judges' chambers to ensure that staff members are complying with established procedures in CourtView. After carefully monitoring these individuals, the Quality Review Specialist will make the appropriate recommendation or referral to the Case Processing Supervisor to ensure that all Civil deputy clerks and chambers' staff are working on the same level and communicating effectively.

Relationship to Court Mission and Goals. The requested positions support the Courts' strategic goal to enhance the administration of justice, particularly, Goal 1.1 to administer justice promptly and effectively.

Relationship to Divisional Objectives. The requested positions would impact divisional objectives by increasing the Division's capacity to ensure that the high quality of the complete electronic record is maintained in a timely manner.

Methodology. The grade level and salary for the requested FTEs were classified pursuant to the D.C. Courts' personnel policies.

Expenditure Plan. The positions would be recruited and hired pursuant to the D.C. Courts' personnel policies.

Table 3  
**CIVIL DIVISION**  
**New Position Requested**

Position	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
File Clerk	JS-04	1	28,000	7,000	35,000
Deputy Clerk I	JS-06	1	35,000	8,000	43,000
Quality Review Specialists	JS-10	2	101,000	24,000	125,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		4	164,000	39,000	203,000

Table 4  
**CIVIL DIVISION**  
**Budget Authority by Object Class**

	<b>FY 2005 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2006 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2007 Request</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	4,709,000	4,871,000	5,292,000	421,000
12 - Benefits	1,130,000	1,169,000	1,270,000	101,000
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<b>5,839,000</b>	<b>6,040,000</b>	<b>6,562,000</b>	<b>522,000</b>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	17,000	17,000	18,000	1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	19,000	19,000	20,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	20,000	20,000	21,000	1,000
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<b>56,000</b>	<b>56,000</b>	<b>59,000</b>	<b>3,000</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,895,000</b>	<b>6,096,000</b>	<b>6,621,000</b>	<b>525,000</b>
FTE	103	103	107	4

Table 5  
**CIVIL DIVISION**  
**Detail, Difference FY 2006/2007**

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2006/2007
11 - Compensation	File Clerk	1	28,000	
	Deputy Clerk 1	1	35,000	
	Quality Review Specialist	2	101,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	103	91,000	
	Current Positions COLA	103	166,000	
Subtotal				421,000
12 - Benefits	File Clerk	1	7,000	
	Deputy Clerk 1	1	8,000	
	Quality Review Specialist	2	24,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	103	22,000	
	Current Positions COLA	103	40,000	
Subtotal				101,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				525,000

Table 6  
**CIVIL DIVISION**  
**Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment**

	2005 Actual	2006 Enacted	2007 Request
JS-3			
JS-4	11	11	12
JS-5	1	1	1
JS-6	19	19	20
JS-7	23	24	16
JS-8	8	8	17
JS-9	22	21	17
JS-10	5	6	9
JS-11	3	3	3
JS-12	5	4	4
JS-13	4	4	5
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	4,709,000	4,871,000	5,292,000
TOTAL	103	103	107

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT  
CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM**

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
7	618,000	7	639,000	7	695,000	0	56,000

The mission of the Crime Victims Compensation Program is to provide assistance to victims and their families with the financial burden of violent crime. The program provides expedient assistance, in a fair and consistent manner, with sensitivity to the dignity of the victim. The program assists innocent victims of violent crime, as well as the survivors of homicide victims and dependent family members, with crime-related expenses including medical, counseling, and funeral bills; lost wages and support; the cost of temporary emergency housing and moving expenses for the health and safety of the victim; replacement of clothing held as evidence; and costs associated with cleaning a crime scene. Applications are filed, investigated, and adjudicated by Compensation Program staff. Additionally, crime victims are provided with assistance in filing applications; in locating other victim service programs, support groups, mental health counseling; and with many of the other quality of life issues that arise after victimization.

**Organizational Background**

During fiscal year 2005, the Compensation Program was staffed by a Director, Program Accountant, Administrative Assistant, two Legal Claims Examiners, and two Victim Advocates. There are a total of seven employees paid from the D.C. Courts' budget. Administrative funds from grants and the Crime Victims Fund also support the Crime Victims Compensation Program. These funds support three additional positions necessary to carry out the functions of the office, two Legal Claims Examiners and one Assistant Claims Examiner. The Crime Victims Compensation Program also relies heavily upon student interns to assist with the growing caseload and continuing supplemental payments. These interns are part of the Court's regular Internship Program and are invaluable. Approximately 4-5 interns are assigned to the Crime Victims Compensation Program each semester and during the summer months. The interns are trained to interview claimants and assist them with filing applications. They also assist in the processing of continuing payments to medical and mental health providers after the claim has been approved. These additional payments may go on for many years in a given case.

**Administrative and Grant Funding**

In addition to appropriated funds, the Crime Victims Compensation Program receives an annual grant from the U.S. Department of Justice under the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA.) The grant amount is based on the amount of claims paid to victims. The Crime Victims Compensation Program receives 60% of the amount paid in victims' claims in the two years prior to the year of award. The grant is used to pay victims' claims. In accordance with the administrative

guidelines of the VOCA Act, up to 5% of the grant may be used for administrative expenses including staff, training and other items related to the operation of the office. Apart from the grant, the law allows the use of a portion of the Crime Victims Fund for administrative expenses. Pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 4-515(e) no more than 5% of the Crime Victims Fund may be used to pay administrative costs necessary to operate the program. These administrative funds are separate from those of the grant.

### **Division MAP Objectives**

The Management Action Plan objectives of the Crime Victims Compensation Program are as follows:

- To appropriately classify cases to reflect an accurate pending caseload.
- To institute examiner on duty assignment to better utilize staff time.
- To process routine claims within 6 weeks.
- To make fair and consistent claims.
- To collaborate with other agencies to enhance case management and social services to domestic violence victims located in hotels.
- To seek available grant funding to pay crime victim claims and support the effective administration of the program.
- To publicize the existence of the Program in the community as mandated by the D.C. Official Code §4-503(c)(6).
- To develop performance management elements and standards for the staff of the Crime Victims Compensation Program.

### **Division Restructuring or Work Process Redesign**

The major activities of the Crime Victims Compensation Program are case processing, record management, outreach, and administrative functions. The activities associated with case processing account for almost all functions of the office and affect every position. The major tasks associated with case processing are victim interview, input in the case management software, verification and investigation of the claim, recommendation, review, and approval. This process is somewhat shortened for supplemental claims, (i.e., all additional payments made after the initial payment) because there is no need for an additional interview or input of information in the software system; however, verification of the additional payment must still take place to ensure that it is a crime-related expense.

**Claims processing redesign.** The Crime Victims Compensation Program has developed a classification plan to differentiate abandoned claims from active claims and either close the cases administratively or determine that the claimant is eligible, but there are no current payments to be made in the case. The Program Director and the Program Accountant aggressively review and classify claims that have not had any activity in over 90 days. In FY 2004, 497, or 19.6% of the determinations were classified as “Eligible no payment,” where an application was filed by a claimant and no bills were ever submitted for payment, or “Administrative closures,” where the

application is filed, however, insufficient information is provided to make a determination regarding eligibility. In both categories, the claim may be reopened once the claimant provides additional information; however, it is no longer regarded as a pending case.

**Student Interns.** The Crime Victims Compensation Program has utilized the Court's Student Intern Program to assist with the intake of new applications and the processing of supplemental claims. The student interns have proven to be a tremendous asset to the office and, as an added bonus, have gained a real "hands on" learning experience from our client population.

**Outreach Protocols.** To strengthen program outreach, the Crime Victims Compensation Program determined that resources would be best used to establish protocols with major agencies and organizations that have direct contact with victims, such as the District of Columbia's Metropolitan Police Department (MPD), the Children's Hospital Child and Adolescent Protection Center, U.S. Attorney's Victim Witness Assistance Unit, the Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia, the D.C. Medical Examiner's Office, and the Chinatown Service Center. These protocols enhance the ability of the Compensation Program to serve greater numbers of victims of violent crime and reach victims that are likely to be eligible for compensation, reducing staff time spent with victims that the Program cannot serve and the effort expended in the denial of a claim. Applications as well as informational brochures are provided to victims by these organizations. In addition to the traditional methods of outreach, the Crime Victims Compensation Program has established an "In-Service" Training Schedule which invites community organizations to attend our bi-weekly staff meetings and present information about their organizations and the services that they can offer crime victims, such as food, housing, legal services, and employment referrals to supplement the services provided by the Compensation Program. This has proven to be an invaluable outreach tool because it creates a new point of contact in the organization and leads to many new referrals.

### **Workload Data**

Table 1  
**CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM**  
**Caseload Overview**

	Actual FY2004	FY 2005 Estimated	% Change
New Cases Filed	2,229	2,300	3.2%
Determinations Made	2,530	2,620	3.6%
Number of Cases Pending at End of Fiscal Year	996	676	-32.1%

Table 2  
**CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM**  
**Performance Measurement Table**

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimated FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Input	# Of new claims filed	Case Management Software	2,229	2,300	2,374	2,450
Output	# Of claims processed	Case Management Software	2,530	2,620	2,714	2,812
Output	# Of payments	Case Management Software	8,465	8,110 <sup>1</sup>	8,515	8,940
Outcome	Dollar amount of payments	Case Management Software	\$7,048,919	\$7,400,000	\$7,770,000	\$8,158,000
Outcome	Avg. claim processing time	Case Management Software	11 weeks	9.1 weeks	7 weeks	5 weeks

**FY 2007 Request**

In FY 2007, the Courts request \$695,000 for the Crime Victims Compensation Program, an increase of \$56,000 (9%) above the FY 2006 Enacted level. The request consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 3  
**CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM**  
**Budget Authority by Object Class**

	<b>FY 2005 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2006 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2007 Request</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	485,000	502,000	547,000	45,000
12 - Benefits	116,000	120,000	131,000	11,000
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<b>601,000</b>	<b>622,000</b>	<b>678,000</b>	<b>56,000</b>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	15,000	15,000	15,000	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	1,000	1,000	1,000	0
31 - Equipment	1,000	1,000	1,000	0
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<b>17,000</b>	<b>17,000</b>	<b>17,000</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>618,000</b>	<b>639,000</b>	<b>695,000</b>	<b>56,000</b>
FTE	7	7	7	0

<sup>1</sup> Reduction in number of actual payments is due to the provision of food at hotels for victims receiving temporary emergency food and shelter. Individual payments for separate food cards are not provided as frequently as a result of this change.

Table 4  
**CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM**  
**Detail Difference, FY 2006/2007**

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2006/2007
11 - Compensation	Current Position WIG	7	28,000	
	Current Position COLA	7	17,000	
Subtotal				45,000
12 - Benefits	Current Position WIG	7	7,000	
	Current Position COLA	7	4,000	
Subtotal				11,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				56,000

Table 5  
**CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION PROGRAM**  
**Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment**

	2005 Actual	2006 Enacted	2007 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8			
JS-9	1	1	
JS-10	1	2	1
JS-11	2		
JS-12	1	2	4
JS-13	1	1	1
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salary	485,000	502,000	547,000
Total	7	7	7



**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR  
CRIMINAL DIVISION**

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
118	7,103,000	118	7,331,000	118	8,273,000	0	942,000

**Mission Statement**

The mission of the Criminal Division is to ensure fairness; to provide quality support services, efficient and timely case processing, and information to other Federal and District of Columbia law enforcement and criminal justice agencies and to the public, and public access; to promote high standards of conduct; and to enhance community-based initiatives and restorative and rehabilitative justice through the community courts.

The Criminal Division is responsible for processing cases prosecuted by the United States Attorney and the District of Columbia Attorney General involving violations of the United States Code, District of Columbia Official Code, and municipal and traffic regulations. The Division serves as the liaison between the Superior Court and the Department of Corrections, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the Metropolitan Police Department, and other criminal justice agencies.

**Organizational Background**

The Criminal Division was created in accordance with the D.C. Official Code, which establishes divisions and permits further division into branches by Rule of Court. The duties of the Division include the following: processing and trial of all criminal cases in the District of Columbia that are not exclusively Federal, analyzing and improving assignments, calendars and dockets; seeking improved services and new methods; recommending changes and improvements to rules and procedures; automating operations and services for increased and innovative uses; compiling statistical and public information; and assuming responsibilities as delegated by the Executive Officer and other Court officers.

The Division provides quality administrative and supportive services for the Superior Court of the District of Columbia with direct courtroom support for judicial officers, uniform assignment of cases to judges, accurate daily calendars for courtroom operation, efficient case processing, and timely delivery of information regarding criminal cases to the Division's many constituents.

The Criminal Division is comprised of four branches: (1) Case Management Branch; (2) Courtroom Support Branch; (3) Special Proceedings Branch; and the (4) Quality Assurance Branch. The Division also operates two community courts: D.C. and Traffic Community Court and East of the River Community Court (ERCC)

- The Case Management Branch, which consists of 28 FTEs, processes felony, misdemeanor, and traffic cases and provides judicial officers, public law enforcement officers, and court staff with access to accurate information regarding criminal cases before the Superior Court.
- The Courtroom Support Branch, which consists of 48 FTEs, is responsible for staffing all Criminal Division courtrooms with courtroom clerks and for maintaining the Division's Property Office. The Property Office receives and secures court evidence and maintains an inventory of forms used to process criminal cases in the Superior Court.
- The Special Proceedings Branch, which consists of 22 FTEs, is responsible for processing bench warrants, search warrants, arrest warrants, subpoenas, habeas corpus writs, fugitive cases, out-of-state witness cases, grand jury directives, sex offender registration matters, mental competency cases, cases to be expunged or sealed, contempt of court/show cause orders; processing appeals for these cases; and maintaining closed criminal case files. This branch also responds to inquiries from the general public, judicial staff, and criminal justice agencies regarding criminal cases; enters and updates data in the Washington Area Law Enforcement System (WALES) and the National Crime Information Center (NCIC); and coordinates the storage and retrieval of archived criminal cases.
- The Quality Assurance Branch, which consists of 14 FTEs, is responsible for the proper and accurate commitment or release of persons as ordered by the Judges of Superior Court; accuracy of the final disposition of cases in the court's IJIS database (formerly the Criminal Information System ("CIS")); and accuracy of statistical reports reflecting the prosecution of criminal cases under the jurisdiction of the Superior Court.
- The East of the River and D.C. and Traffic Community Courts consist of 2 FTEs and are responsible for addressing quality-of-life offenses (e.g. public drinking, panhandling, prostitution, some drug offenses) and minor criminal traffic violations, all of which can have significant negative impact on community's quality of life and can foster more serious crime. Unlike traditional courts, the Community Courts focus on therapeutic and restorative justice more than on guilt or innocence. As such they have a much broader array of responses (i.e. treatment, community service, etc.) at their disposal. Community Courts seek not only to hold offenders accountable for their actions, but also to repair the harm caused to the community by the offense. Community Courts frequently require offenders to "pay back" the community by performing court-supervised community service. They also seek to reduce the likelihood of future offending by linking offenders to needed services.

### **Division MAP Objectives**

The strategic objectives of the Criminal Division follow:

- Ensure the timely and efficient disposition of cases by developing and implementing case management plans, which include time standards, for all major case types.

- Ensure that Court participant waiting time is minimized in high volume calendars by developing staggered scheduling practices for high volume courtrooms.
- Ensure the accuracy and timeliness of Court information by developing time and performance standards for all division functions.
- Ensure that all judges and court staff maintain the highest standards of civility and public service by engaging in a joint judicial/bar training session dedicated to professionalism, ethical behavior, and civility; and staff training dedicated to excellent public service.
- Ensure that the large number of quality of life crimes are addressed by providing a community based justice initiative as a problem-solving approach in the disposition of those cases.
- Work with the Office of Attorney General and the Metropolitan Police Department to establish a system where all bench warrants for alcohol related traffic offenses are executed in a timely manner. This will enhance public safety by ensuring the Court holds these offenders accountable.

#### **Division Restructuring or Work Process Redesign**

In FY 2005, the Criminal Division continued preparations to convert the Court's legacy database to Courtview, the new Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS) case management system. Advanced planning has helped to ensure a smooth and efficient conversion to the new system because the District's entire criminal justice system relies on computer interfaces with the Court's database to help protect public safety. The Criminal Division continued to refine flow-charts of all work processes and documentation of all Division procedures in the new IJIS system. This effort also has assisted in identifying repetitive or inefficient processes that may be eliminated or re-engineered in the conversion to the IJIS database. In addition, to ensure that all employees have the skills that will be necessary when converting to IJIS, the Criminal Division targeted employee training. All employees were tested for keyboarding skills and employees who did not meet the established standard were enrolled in keyboarding training classes. Also, all employees received training in Windows, e-mail, and other PC software. The Court has also work closely with other criminal justice agencies to create new interfaces between IJIS and the other criminal justice agencies that will eventually lead to real-time coordination of all criminal justice agencies' databases.

In FY 2005 the Division continued to focus on quality control functions to ensure the timeliness and accuracy of data in the Court's Criminal Information System, which regularly updates other District criminal justice agencies' databases concerning defendant release status and scheduled court dates. One of the key objectives is to move to a real time update of Court records. In FY 2005 the Criminal Division's goal was to accurately update at least 80% of court actions on the same day the action occurs. Preliminary figures indicate that approximately 85% of all cases have been updated the same day the Court action occurs. Timely and accurate data is essential to protecting public safety and the liberty interests of individuals in the criminal justice system.

The Quality Assurance Branch will continue to coordinate Court interactions with the Department of Corrections and the Federal Bureau of Prisons, which houses all sentenced felons.

### Workload Data

Table 1  
**CRIMINAL DIVISION**  
**Caseload and Efficiency Measures**  
**(Fiscal Year 2004 Data)**

	<u>Cases</u> <u>Filed</u>	<u>Cases</u> <u>Disposed</u>	<u>Clearance</u> <u>Rate*</u>	<u>Cases Pending</u>		
				<u>1-Oct</u>	<u>30-Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
D.C. Misdemeanors	4,751	4,695	99%	244	300	23%
Felony	10,162	10,436	103%	2,724	2,450	-10%
Special Proceedings	3,213	3,220	100%	133	126	-5%
Traffic	10,676	10,664	100%	830	842	1%
U.S. Misdemeanors	20,032	19,790	99%	2,148	2,390	11%
Total	48,834	48,805	100%	6,079	6,108	0%

*\* Ratio of cases disposed to cases filed in a given year. A standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case filed.*

Table 2  
**CRIMINAL DIVISION**  
**Performance Measurement Table**

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimated FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Input	Number of cases filed and reinstatements	CIS database	45,096	45,680	46,300	46,900
Output	Number of cases disposed	CIS database	45,012	45,800	46,700	47,600
Outcome	Misdemeanor cases disposed in < 90 calendar days*	Court Report	58%	60%	62%	63%
Outcome	Felony cases disposed in < 180 calendar days*	Court Report	55%	57%	59%	60%

\* Previously cases days were measured in business days (not inclusive of weekends or holidays). In order to make performance standards more understandable, the Court has moved to calculating time to disposition in calendar days.

### Relationship between base budget and court-wide strategic goals

To enhance the administration of justice the Criminal Division performs three primary functions: (1) case processing; (2) direct courtroom support; and (3) providing information to members of the bar and public. The workload of the judicial staff assigned to the Criminal Division consists of conducting trials and other dispositions of active cases, disposition of motions in active cases and in post sentencing matters filed with the Court, probation revocations for defendants who have violated terms of probation, and dealing with other matters filed in the Division's Special Proceedings Branch. Table 2 provides data on the Criminal Division's case filings and dispositions, and timeliness. The Division's public information workload consists of assisting the public in filing materials with the Court and in retrieving information from Court records. In addition, the Division assists other criminal justice agencies in reviewing Court convictions and providing certified copies of Court records.

### **FY 2007 Request**

The Criminal Division's FY 2007 budget request is \$8,273,000, an increase of \$942,000, or 12.8% above the FY 2006 Request. The request consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 3  
**CRIMINAL DIVISION**  
**Budget Authority by Object Class**

	<b>FY 2005 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2006 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2007 Request</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	5,661,000	5,884,000	6,602,000	758,000
12 - Benefits	1,359,000	1,403,000	1,584,000	181,000
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<b>7,020,000</b>	<b>7,247,000</b>	<b>8,239,443</b>	<b>939,000</b>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				0
22 - Transportation of Things				0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				0
24 - Printing & Reproduction	41,000	42,000	43,000	1,000
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	19,000	19,000	20,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	23,000	23,000	24,000	1,000
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<b>83,000</b>	<b>84,000</b>	<b>87,000</b>	<b>3,000</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,103,000</b>	<b>7,331,000</b>	<b>8,273,00</b>	<b>942,000</b>
FTE	118	118	118	0

Table 4  
**CRIMINAL DIVISION**  
**Detail, Difference FY 2006/FY 2007**

<b>Object Class</b>	<b>Description of Request</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	Current Position WIG	118	559,000	
	Current Position COLA	118	199,000	
Subtotal				758,000
12 - Benefits	Current Position WIG	118	133,000	
	Current Position COLA	118	48,000	
Subtotal				181,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			1,000
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				942,000

Table 5  
**CRIMINAL DIVISION**  
**Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment**

	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Enacted</b>	<b>2007 Request</b>
JS-3			
JS-4	2	2	2
JS-5			
JS-6	11	17	0
JS-7	14	10	0
JS-8	29	20	43
JS-9	31	42	43
JS-10	17	15	17
JS-11	1	0	1
JS-12	5	4	5
JS-13	4	4	5
JS-14	1	1	1
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	5,661,000	5,844,000	6,602,000
Total	118	118	118

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT  
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT**

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
25	1,589,000	25	1,644,000	25	1,744,000	0	100,000

The Superior Court's Domestic Violence Unit is a national model program that processes civil protection orders, criminal misdemeanors and family child support, custody, visitation and divorce actions in which domestic violence is an underlying issue before one designated team of judicial officers.

**Mission Statement**

The mission of the Domestic Violence Unit is to resolve domestic violence disputes, protect domestic violence victims, and keep perpetrators accountable.

The Domestic Violence Unit was established as a specialized problem-solving court to serve litigants in cases in which domestic violence is the underlying issue. Some of its key features include:

- "One stop" intake center for victims. Victims seeking protection, child support, visitation, custody or criminal sanctions enter through one door and file the case(s) they need, without traveling from one agency to another;
- A three-track differentiated case processing system in which specially trained judicial officers hear cases involving each family and possess detailed knowledge of other cases and decisions concerning this same family.
- Integration of the adjudication of criminal and civil domestic violence cases so that parties obtain results for separate cases at one judicial hearing, thereby saving both court/judicial time and victim/involved parties' time.
- Paternity and child support orders are issued during the same proceeding as the civil protection order.
- Community Intake Center, using technology to bring convenience and services to the public in Anacostia.
- Continued communication to hold batterers accountable for abusive behavior.

**Organizational Background**

The Domestic Violence Unit is comprised of 25 administrative staff that supports 6 judicial officers in administering justice and providing services to victims and perpetrators of domestic violence. The Unit processes all cases in Superior Court in which domestic violence is a significant issue before one designated team of judicial officers.

## **MAP Objectives**

The program's main objective is to provide increased access, improved convenience and clear, concise understanding of the court process while maintaining efficiency and quality of court services. The Unit can accomplish this objective through resources being available to interview and respond to public inquiries and needs, and by supporting and staffing the satellite center annex in the Southeast community, making forms and service-provider information available to parties via the internet, hand outs and public service announcements.

Other objectives for the Domestic Violence Unit include to:

- To process cases timely.
- To provide petitioners immediate relief through the temporary protection order process.
- To hold perpetrators accountable through a deferred sentencing and judicial review process that requires the perpetrator to appear in court throughout the treatment/counseling period.
- Report on Court activity regarding domestic violence filings, dispositions, trends, and changes to process or procedures.
- Ensure that case information is processed, updated completely, correctly and within Unit time standards.
- Re-examine workflow, process, and procedural designs.
- Reduce waiting time for court participants and equalize daily case schedules by limiting the number of cases to be heard on individual days.
- Enhance access to justice for Spanish-speaking court users by translating all court forms into Spanish.
- Provide orientation and training for new employees, emphasizing the role of the individual to the overall mission of the Unit and the Court.

## **Restructuring or Work Process Redesign**

To enhance access to services for approximately two-thirds of the domestic violence victims, who reside in the Southeast section of the District, the Unit opened a satellite Intake Center at Greater Southeast Hospital, modeled after the Court's "one stop" center. Using the technology of videoconferencing between the satellite center and the courthouse, domestic violence victims can receive a temporary protection order and support services without physically coming to the Superior Court. Victims may obtain relief at the satellite center; thereby saving travel time; transportation and parking costs and, often, child care costs. Following the first year of operation the Southeast Center assisted an average of 130 persons per month. The number of victims served is increasing over time as more persons become aware of the Center's availability.

## **Workload Data**

In FY 2004, the Domestic Violence Unit processed 8,479 new filings plus 1,630 reinstated cases (total 10,109) and disposed of 10,138 cases. Table 1 below provides caseload data for the



Domestic Violence Unit. Table 2 provides performance data for the Domestic Violence Unit for the Fiscal Years 2004 through 2007.

Table 1  
**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT**  
**Caseload and Efficiency Measures**  
(Fiscal Year 2004 Data)

	<u>Cases</u> <u>Filed</u>	<u>Cases</u> <u>Disposed</u>	<u>Clearance</u> <u>Rate*</u>	<u>Cases Pending</u>		
				<u>1-Oct</u>	<u>30-Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
Contempt Motions	239	264	110%	39	38	-3%
Intrafamily (Protection Orders)	4,691	4,676	100%	220	235	7%
Paternity & Child Support	350	333	95%	74	91	23%
U.S. Misdemeanors	4,829	4,865	101%	810	774	-4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,109</b>	<b>10,153</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,143</b>	<b>1,138</b>	<b>0%</b>

\* Ratio of cases disposed to cases added in a given year. A standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case added.

Table 2  
**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT**  
**Performance Measurement Table**

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimated FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Output/Activity	Hearings scheduled	Yearly stats/ Random sample	24,900	25,000	25,200	25,500
Quality	% of cases reviewed and processed within 48 hours	Evaluation, survey, and random sample	91%	91%	91%	91%
End Outcome	Domestic Violence dispositions	Daily/Monthly Statistics	10,153	10,200	10,300	10,500
Productivity/ Efficiency	Case clearance rates	Yearly statistics	101%	100%	100%	100%

### **FY 2007 Request**

The Court's FY 2007 request for the Domestic Violence Unit is \$1,744,000, an increase of \$100,000 or 6.0% above the FY 2006 Enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in cost increases.

Table 3  
**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT**  
**Budget Authority by Object Class**

	<b>FY 2005 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2006 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2007 Request</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	1,276,000	1,320,000	1,401,000	81,000
12 - Benefits	306,000	317,000	336,000	19,000
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<i>1,582,000</i>	<i>1,637,000</i>	<i>1,737,000</i>	<i>100,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	3,000	3,000	3,000	
31 - Equipment	4,000	4,000	4,000	
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<i>7,000</i>	<i>7,000</i>	<i>7,000</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,589,000</b>	<b>1,644,000</b>	<b>1,744,000</b>	<b>100,000</b>
FTE	25	25	25	0

Table 4  
**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT**  
**Detail Difference, FY 2006/2007**

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY2006/FY2007
11 - Compensation	Current Position WIG	25	36,000	
	Current Position COLA	25	45,000	
Subtotal				81,000
12 - Benefits	Current Position WIG	25	9,000	
	Current Position COLA	25	10,000	
Subtotal				19,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				100,000

Table 5  
**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNIT**  
**Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment**

	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Enacted</b>	<b>2007 Request</b>
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	1	1	
JS-7	4	1	2
JS-8	7	8	9
JS-9	6	9	7
JS-10	2	2	3
JS-11			
JS-12		1	1
JS-13	3	2	2
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total salary	1,276,000	1,320,000	1,401,000
Total	25	25	25

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT  
FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS**

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
167	11,300,000	180	12,369,000	182	13,847,000	2	1,478,000

**Mission Statement**

The mission of the Family Court is to protect and support children brought before it, strengthen families in trouble, provide permanency for children and decide disputes involving families fairly and expeditiously, while treating all parties with dignity and respect.

**Organizational Background**

On January 8, 2002, the District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001 (“the Act”) was enacted, resulting in significant reforms of what was formerly the Family Division of the Superior Court. The intent of the Act is to ensure the safety and well being of children and families in the District of Columbia. Specifically, the Act mandates the recruitment of specially trained and qualified judges to serve on the Family Court at least three or five years, depending on their date of appointment. It requires that all Family cases remain assigned to judges serving on the Family Court bench. The Act also requires the implementation of a one judge/one family case management model to facilitate more informed decision making, improve the delivery of services to a family, avoid the risk of conflicting orders, and reduce the number of court appearances for a family.

The Family Court retains jurisdiction over all familial actions – child abuse, custody and support, mental health, juvenile, marriages, and divorce. It is a leader among a growing number of unified family courts around the nation. The Office of the Director, seven administrative branches, two support offices, the Family Court Self Help Center and the Family Treatment Court make up Family Court Operations.

1. The Domestic Relations Branch processes divorce, annulment, custody, and adoption cases.
2. The Paternity and Child Support Branch processes all actions seeking to establish paternity and child support and issues wage-withholding orders to employers of non-custodial parents to satisfy court-ordered support.
3. The Juvenile and Neglect Branch is responsible for cases involving children alleged to be delinquent, neglected, abused or otherwise in need of supervision.
4. The Counsel for Child Abuse and Neglect (CCAN) Office recruits, trains, and assigns attorneys to provide representation for children, eligible parents, and caretakers in proceedings of child abuse and neglect.
5. The Mental Health/Mental Retardation Branch is responsible for matters involving the commitment of individuals who are mentally ill or substantially retarded.

6. The Marriage Bureau issues licenses and authorizations for marriages in the District of Columbia and maintains a list of officiates who perform civil weddings in the court.
7. The Quality Control Office supports all branches by processing prisoner transfer requests, preparing daily assignments for courtroom clerks and court aides, reviewing juvenile files post hearing, and conducting limited reviews of abuse and neglect files to facilitate compliance with the Adoptions and Safe Families Act (ASFA).
8. The Attorney Advisor's Office, created in response to the Family Court Act of 2001, assists the Family Court in maintaining compliance with the Federal ASFA, the D.C. ASFA and other child welfare laws applicable to abuse and neglect cases.
9. The Central Intake Center (CIC) is an innovation arising from the Family Court's implementation of the Family Court Act of 2001. The CIC serves as the initial point of contact between the public and the Family Court. Its primary mission is to provide comprehensive, timely, and efficient case processing services to the citizens of the District of Columbia and public agencies from one centralized location. The CIC initiates cases and receives all case filings, as well as the case filing fees. The CIC is the primary location for the dissemination of Family Court case status information to the public.
10. The Family Court Self Help Center (SHC), developed in collaboration with the D.C. Bar, provides legal information and assistance to self-represented parties in Family Court cases.
11. The Family Treatment Court, created as a result of a partnership between the Family Court and the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Children, Youth, Families, and Elders, in cooperation with key District health and human services stakeholders, is a voluntary comprehensive residential substance abuse treatment program for mothers/female caretakers whose children are the subject of a child neglect case.

### **Division MAP Objectives**

#### Strategic Issue I: Enhancing the Administration of Justice

Goal 1.1: The Courts will administer justice promptly and efficiently.

Strategy 1.1.1 Institute case management plans that utilize best practices and time standards to ensure prompt case processing of abuse and neglect cases.

Objective 1. Enhance the administration of justice through increased monitoring and compliance with the Federal and D.C. Adoption and Safe Families Acts by 10%.

Goal 1.3: The Courts will ensure informed judicial decision-making.

Strategy 1.3.1: Provide accurate, timely, and complete information to judges, court personnel, and other court participants.

Objective 2. Enhance the timely processing of cases by ensuring that 95% of court files, including exhibits, are complete and available for courtroom proceedings.

#### Strategic Issue 2: Broadening Access to Justice and Service to the Public

Goal 2.3: The Courts will ensure that procedures and processes are free of unnecessary barriers to access.

Strategy 2.3.1. Identify and revise court procedures, rules, and processes that are unreasonable barriers to access.

Objective 4. Increase the number of persons assisted by the Family Court Self Help Center, the number of persons who better understand the court process, and the number of persons who receiving excellent service by 5% by December 31, 2007.

Strategy 2.3.2: Develop mechanisms to enhance understanding of court proceedings by non-English speaking persons and others with communication or language impediments.

Objective 5. Improve access to Family Court services for Spanish speaking customers by providing bilingual staff in the Central Intake Center and each of the branches within the Family Court by December 2005.

Objective 6. Enhance understanding of the court process by Spanish speaking persons by translating 100% of existing forms/orders identified suitable for translation by September 2006.

### Strategic Issue 3: Promoting Competence, Professionalism, and Civility

Goal 3.3: The Courts will promote high standards of conduct and personal behavior among participants.

Strategy 3.3.1: Promote adherence to codes of professional conduct and ethical practice standards and/or civility standards for all judges, court personnel, and members of the Bar.

Objective 3. Promote a competent and well -trained Family Court CCAN Bar by ensuring compliance with Practice Standards certification requirements.

### **Restructuring or Work Process Redesign**

During FY 2004, the Family Court developed and began operating the Family Court Central Intake Center (CIC) for the purpose of consolidating all family case filing and fee collection functions in one location to enhance public access and customer service. Although in its infancy, the CIC is experiencing an increase in demand for its services. As the court and its stakeholders become more versed in the technology offered by the Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS), they are requiring that the CIC use more of this technology in immediate notification, cross referencing, and imaging of filings so as to make them immediately available to all appropriate court personnel. The filings currently received and processed by the CIC were previously handled by four separate branches and involve seven substantive and very distinct areas of the law. Consequently, they are governed by different legal requirements and timelines thereby creating a challenging environment for the staff of the CIC. Process review, revision, and reengineering activities are constant as are intense training and monitoring of staff assigned to the CIC.

In 2004, the Family Court began the process of consolidating identities in cases involving families and children. As IJIS development moved to other divisions of the court, literally thousands of additional identity records were converted from legacy systems into the new system raising the identity consolidation effort to a higher priority. Through the use of on-site contractors, the Family Court leads the effort in researching and identifying identities that must be consolidated to ensure the data integrity in IJIS in family and other case types as well as to

facilitate compliance with the one judge/one family mandate of the Act. Additional contractors have been hired and work under the direct supervision of Family Court managers. Weekly reports of their productivity are created and distributed to all affected divisions of the Court. The expectation is that the identity consolidation function will be funded and incorporated into the functions of the Superior Court as an ongoing operational component.

On December 9, 2004, the Child Support Services Division (CSSD) formerly the Child Support Enforcement Division of the Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia (formerly the Office of the Corporation Counsel), working with key court officials, successfully transitioned the collection and disbursement functions attendant to child support collections from the Superior Court to the CSSD, which subsequently contracted with a private vendor to perform these functions. The Court continued to engage in collection activities concurrently with the contractor through January 31, 2005 to avoid any disruption in payments to the families receiving child support. Currently, the Court and the CSSD are actively working to transition the remaining collections function, income withholding, to the CSSD. The Court, assisted by on-site contractors, will continue to perform wage-withholding functions until the transfer of that responsibility is successfully completed. The projected date for completion is December 2005.

In November 2002, the Family Court, in collaboration with volunteers from the D.C. Bar, developed an on-site Self Help Center to provide much needed legal assistance to the substantial number of unrepresented litigants in Family Court matters. The Center was staffed primarily by volunteer lawyers from the Family Law Section of the D.C. Bar and operated during limited hours until March of 2005, when the Court hired three full time employees to staff the Center. The Family Court Self Help Center provides improved access to justice for families and facilitates the resolution of familial disputes in a fair and expeditious manner.

### **Workload Data**

Table 1  
**FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS**  
**Caseload and Efficiency Measures**  
(Fiscal Year 2004 Data)

	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Clearance</u>	<u>Cases Pending</u>		
	<u>Filed</u>	<u>Disposed</u>	<u>Rate*</u>	<u>1-Oct</u>	<u>30-Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
Abuse & Neglect	802	1,565	195%	4,184	3,421	-18%
Adoption	444	720	162%	899	623	-31%
Divorce/Custody/Miscellaneous	3,615	4,171	115%	2,829	2,273	-20%
Juvenile	2,824	2,469	87%	670	1,025	53%
Mental Health/Mental Retardation	1,822	1,802	99%	1,291	1,311	2%
Paternity & Child Support	<u>4,547</u>	<u>4,587</u>	101%	<u>6,104</u>	<u>6,064</u>	-1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,054</b>	<b>15,314</b>	<b>109%</b>	<b>15,977</b>	<b>14,717</b>	<b>-7.89%</b>

\*Ratio of cases disposed to cases filed in a given year. Standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case filed.

Table 2  
**FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS**  
**Key Performance Indicators**

Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Projection FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Prisoner Transfers Processed*	Monthly Statistics	2,122	2,127	2,177	2,227
Delinquency & Neglect Cases/Orders Reviewed*	Monthly Statistics	14,021	21,000	21,375	21,755
Delinquency & Neglect Corrected*	Monthly Statistics	466	511	566	621
Applications for Marriage Licenses & Minister Authorizations*	Monthly Statistics	5,990	7,188	8,626	10,351
Marriage Licenses & Authorizations Issued*	Monthly Statistics	7,894	9,473	11,368	13,642
Petitions and Complaints Filed*	Monthly Statistics	14,054	20,831	22,914	23,214
Domestic & Child Support Hearings Set*	Monthly Statistics	24,058	26,494	30,080	15,545
Child Support Orders Issued*	Monthly Statistics	3,484	3,858	4,318	4,788
Mental Retardation (MR) Advocate Recruitment Efforts	Computer Log; Advocate Roster	600	750	975	1,150
MR Advocate Training Sessions	Computer Log	50	150	200	250
New MR Advocates recruited	Computer Log	200	300	450	600
MR Advocates Trained	Computer; Training Log	575	775	950	1,150
MR Cases with MR Advocates	Computer Log	234	300	500	800
ASFA case reviews in initial, further initial, pretrial, stipulation, disposition and permanency hearings	Monthly Statistics	582	1,801	2,970	3,654
CourtView data input and other error notifications drafted and distributed by attorney advisors	Monthly Statistics	25	500	825	990
Adult Attorneys appointed**	Monthly Statistics	2,110	2,841	2,800	2,800
Guardians <i>ad litem</i> Appointed**	Monthly Statistics	1,081	1,461	1,450	1,450
Trainings Offered to Attorneys**	CCAN Records	16	23	23	23
Attorneys Meeting CLE Requirements**	CCAN Records	163	170	170	170

\*Projections based on statistical regression from Actual FY03 through Multiplied Average of FY '05 to date.



\*\* Projections based on CCAN attorney appointments and trainings remaining approximately constant without new variables.

## **FY 2007 REQUEST**

For FY 2007, District of Columbia Courts request \$13,847,000 for Family Court Operations, an increase of \$1,478,000 (12%) above the FY 2006 Enacted level. The requested increase includes 2 FTEs and \$940,000 to enhance service to the mentally retarded and \$507,000 for built-in cost increases.

### ***Enhancing Service to the Mentally Retarded - \$940,000***

***Advocate Stipends, \$728,000***

***2 Advocate Case Monitors (JS-9), \$122,000***

***Advocate Program Operation, \$90,000***

Problem Statement: To meet statutory requirements to provide advocates for mentally retarded individuals whose cases remain under Court supervision upon commitment to the District, the Family Court must develop a substantial pool of advocates committed to ensuring the well-being and protecting the best interests of these individuals placed in long-term care. As of March 2005, there were only 219 advocates for 1,214 mentally retarded persons. Fewer than 25% of the mentally retarded persons have advocates. This population is extremely dependent upon the advocates, as 80% of the mentally retarded persons under court supervision are non-verbal and cannot easily communicate their needs and desires. Accordingly, the advocates' role is intense: they visit the client for two to three hours twice a month, filling out reports on these visits; they meet with service providers; they participate in court hearings; and they attend 60 hours of training each year.

In 1981, the Superior Court encouraged the creation of the District of Columbia Mental Retardation Volunteer Advocates Association, Inc., a not-for-profit organization to provide well-trained and qualified advocates for mentally retarded clients as required by the law. Since that time, the Court, in conjunction with the Advocates Association, has recruited volunteers to comply with the need for advocacy.

In 2001, Congress financed a full-time Mental Retardation Volunteer Coordinator and a small program budget. The Coordinator has sought to recruit advocates through print and audio mediums, advertisements in the Metro and on buses, providing community service hours for college and law students, and addressing churches and civic associations. In FY 2004, the Volunteer Coordinator initiated 600 recruitment efforts and provided 575 sessions of training for incoming advocates, current advocates, and newly employed case managers for the District's Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Administration (MRDDA), the agency charged with caring for the clients. Despite these efforts, with only one staff person dedicated to this function and relying on volunteerism, the Court has struggled to maintain the current 219 advocates.

The Court believes that a greater number of advocates can be recruited and retained if a stipend is provided.<sup>2</sup> Funding for the program is requested under Sections 7-1304.13 (i) and (j) of D.C. Official Code, which state in part that the Court shall seek potential sources of funding at the federal and District levels and provide the advocates with facilities, supplies, and secretarial and other support services sufficient to enable them to carry out their duties under the law.

There have been longstanding concerns, most recently expressed during a visit by a federal “Evans” case monitor, that mentally retarded persons who are committed or admitted to the District of Columbia for care have not received court appointed advocates as required by D.C. Official Code 7-1304.13:

- (a) Mentally retarded persons who admit themselves to a facility under § 7-1303.02, and mentally retarded persons whose commitment is sought under § 7-1303.04 or § 7-1303.06, shall have the assistance of a mental retardation advocate in every proceeding and at each stage in such proceedings under this chapter.
- (b) Upon receipt of the petition for commitment or notification of admission as provided in § 7-1303.02, 7-1303.04, and 7-1303.06, the Court shall appoint a qualified mental retardation advocate selected from a list of such advocates it maintains.

The law requires that advocates have training and experience in the field of mental retardation and delineates the powers and duties of the advocates. They include the following:

- To guide and assist the person to encourage self reliance and to enable the person to participate to the greatest extent possible in decisions concerning his or her habilitation plan.
- Advocates act as liaison between their clients and the Court and between the Court and the community. Advocates establish contact with mentally retarded persons and their families, where possible. Advocates also assist in court proceedings, meetings, and conferences in relation to any matter concerning their clients.
- Advocates visit residences and program sites to monitor the client’s quality of life and to determine whether clients are benefiting from habilitative care. Advocates are required to visit a minimum of twice each month, typically for two to three hours each visit, and to complete a “Compliance Check List” on their findings.
- Advocates review reports, evaluations, and records relating to mentally retarded persons, and they have access to all personnel, facilities, and agency staff. Interviews with staff and review of records are important to assist advocates in assessing the appropriateness

---

<sup>2</sup> There are numerous examples of successful advocacy programs that utilize this mechanism. For example, in Michigan, the Unemployment Insurance Agency (UIA) has recruited and maintained a core of paid advocates for the unemployed. “Advocates are independent contractors...for their services, advocates receive \$50 for a pre-hearing consultation and \$100 for representation at a hearing.” UIA’s Advocacy Program, the only successful program of its kind in the country, began in 1991 and handled over 8,000 cases last year and currently has 130 advocates throughout the state.

of programs, services, and care being received. Advocates are required to submit a Monthly Status Report to the Court.

- Advocates must be present at all court hearings for each client. Advocates are also required to be present at Individual Service Plan (ISP) meetings coordinated once per year by the Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Administration (MRDDA) as well as all meetings about the implementation of the Individual Service Plan.

To enhance recruitment and retention of advocate, the Court seeks to pay a \$600 annual stipend for each case of a mentally retarded client that an advocate oversees. In addition, the request includes funds to hire two additional staff persons to assist with the recruitment, training, and support of advocates. These two Advocate Case Monitors will augment the existing staff person and expand the Court's recruitment activities and serve the anticipated significantly larger pool of advocates.

Full program funding to provide additional administrative support, recruit and train advocates, and provide compensation or stipends to encourage advocate retention is critical. Stipends, Advocate Case Monitors, and technical support and assistance will permit the long-term success of the advocate program and ensure that the mentally retarded cared for by the government receive appropriate care and necessary services. The civil rights of these very vulnerable members of society must be protected.

Proposed Resolution: The Courts seek funds to provide a \$600 annual stipend, to hire two advocate case monitors, and to provide operational support to the advocates. The hourly stipend would provide modest compensation to advocates for their duties, written reports, and attendance at Court hearings. The advocate case monitors would help recruit, train, and provide support to the advocates, and operational support funds would provide recruitment and training materials and administrative support to the advocates.

Relationship to Court Mission, Vision and Strategic Goals: This request supports the Courts' strategic goal of enhancing the administration of justice, particularly Goal 1.2 to administer justice fairly and Strategy 1.2.1 to ensure that court procedures and processes properly adhere to laws, rules, and relevant policies by enabling the Family Court to meet statutory requirements to provide advocates.

Relationship to Divisional Objectives: The positions are crucial in ensuring the Family Court's compliance with the legal mandate to provide well trained volunteer advocates to monitor the level of care received by mentally retarded persons and to assist in protecting the civil rights of these clients.

Relationship to Existing Funding: The program currently has one staff member and approximately \$13,000 for advocate recruitment, training, and support costs. As discussed above, these resources have proven inadequate to meet the statutory requirements and the needs of mentally retarded persons under the Court's supervision.

Methodology: The positions are requested at a grade 9 based on the Court's classification policies. Stipends for the court-appointed advocates are based on an annual stipend of \$600 per client, for a total of 1214 mentally retarded persons (a committed person typically remains under court supervision for his entire life, so the number of cases under the jurisdiction of the court changes little). The operational expenses are estimated at an additional \$90,000 for printed materials, advocate recruitment and retention, training, equipment.

In 2004, the D.C. Courts engaged the services of Booz Allen Hamilton (BAH) to conduct a second staffing and workload analyses in the Family Court because of changes occurring as a result of the Family Court Act and implementation of the Integrated Justice Information System. A tool BAH developed to measure the activities and tasks associated with the successful recruitment of advocates for the Mental Retardation Advocate Program identified a staffing gap in this program of 5.66 FTEs.

Expenditure Plan: The requested employees will be recruited and hired in accordance with the D.C. Courts' Personnel Policies.

Performance Indicators: Success of the position will be measured through the employee's performance plans to include standards that measure the efficient management of the Mental Retardation Volunteer Advocate Program's caseload and stakeholders as well as judicial feedback that confirms the satisfaction of the level of advocacy provided for those individuals with mental retardation in the District of Columbia.

Table 3  
**FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS**  
**New Positions Requested**

Position	Grade	Number	Salary	Benefits	Total Personnel Cost
Case Advocate Monitor	JS-9	2	98,000	24,000	122,000

Table 4  
**FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS**  
**Budget Authority by Object Class**

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Difference FY 2006/2007
11 - Compensation	8,229,000	9,078,000	9,582,000	504,000
12 - Benefits	1,975,000	2,180,000	2,301,000	121,000
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<b>10,204,000</b>	<b>11,258,000</b>	<b>11,883,000</b>	<b>625,000</b>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	196,000	199,000	203,000	4,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	11,000	11,000	24,000	13,000
25 - Other Services	564,000	572,000	1,311,000	739,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	27,000	27,000	118,000	91,000

31 - Equipment	298,000	302,000	308,000	6,000
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<i>1,096,000</i>	<i>1,111,000</i>	<i>1,964,000</i>	<i>853,000</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	11,300,000	12,369,000	13,847,000	1,478,000
<b>FTE</b>	167	180	182	2

Table 5  
**FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS**  
**Detail, Difference FY 2006/2007**

<b>Object Class</b>	<b>Description of Request</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	Advocate Case Monitor	2	98,000	
	Current Position WIGS	180	97,000	
	Current Positions COLA	180	309,000	
Subtotal				504,000
12 - Benefits	Advocate Case Monitor	2	24,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	180	23,000	
	Current Positions COLA	180	74,000	
Subtotal				121,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	Built-in			4,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			13,000
25 - Other Service	Built-in		11,000	
	Advocate Stipends		728,000	
Subtotal				739,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in		1,000	
	Advocate Supplies		90,000	
Subtotal				91,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			6,000
Total				1,478,000

Table 6  
**FAMILY COURT OPERATIONS**  
**Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment**

	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Enacted</b>	<b>2007 Request</b>
JS-3			
JS-4	7	7	7
JS-5			
JS-6	13	21	21
JS-7	31	31	31
JS-8	40	40	40
JS-9	35	36	38
JS-10	8	9	9
JS-11	8	8	8
JS-12	9	11	11
JS-13	13	14	14
JS-14	2	2	2
JS-15			
JS-16			

JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	8,229,000	9,078,000	9,582,000
Total	167	180	182

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT  
FAMILY COURT: SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION**

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
133	12,147,000 <sup>3</sup>	133	13,311,000	133	14,218,000	0	907,000

**Mission Statement**

The mission of the Social Services Division is to assist the District of Columbia Superior Court's Family Court and juvenile justice system in the rehabilitation of youths through the provision of comprehensive services and probation supervision to enhance public safety by preventing recidivism and protecting the community.

**Organizational Background**

The Social Services Division is charged with overseeing and managing the lion-share of the front-end of the District of Columbia's juvenile justice system.<sup>4</sup> Responsibilities include, but are not limited to: (1) assessing each youth's risk to public safety, conducting home and family assessments and making petition recommendations to the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) and advising the Court throughout all phases of the adjudication process; (2) developing sound comprehensive probation supervision plans/agreements as an alternative to detention; and (3) coordinating appropriate services for juveniles and families. The Division encompasses the director's office, four branches, four units, and one education/vocation coordinator:

- The Director's Office is responsible for management and oversight of all objectives, programs, and activities across the division. The Office has 5 FTEs.
- The Juvenile Intake & Diagnostic Branch is responsible for screening and processing all truancy, persons in need of supervision (PINS), and delinquency referrals. Additionally, the branch is responsible for developing pre-trial and pre-disposition diagnostic reports and coordinating pre-trial and pre-disposition services. The branch consists of three Intake components, one of which is located at the Youth Services Center (YCS) and, two diagnostic components. The Intake & Diagnostic branch has 37 FTEs.

<sup>3</sup> In FY 05 two management positions were converted to create two deputy clerk positions and two drug treatment counselor positions resulting in an increase of 2 FTEs for a total of 133 FTEs.

<sup>4</sup> The District of Columbia's juvenile justice system encompasses an array of stakeholders. Four central entities responsible for the vast majority of youths include: the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD), D.C. Superior Court, Court Social Services and Office of the Attorney General (OAG), frequently referred to as "the front-end."

- The Child Guidance/Family Services Branch provides an array of diagnostic evaluations to include psychological, psycho-educational, and neuro-psychological testing and assessments utilized to determine the needs of each youth and family and guide judicial decision-making in the Family Court. The branch also provides comprehensive individual and family counseling to youth and families and, provides Domestic Relations home studies to assist the Court in the determination of custody placements. These efforts are augmented by a comprehensive doctoral intern and extern-training program managed by the branch. The branch encompasses the following components: Child Guidance, Family Counseling, and Domestic Relations. The branch has 16 FTEs.
- The Probation Supervision Branch consists of six probation components, four of which are strategically located in satellite offices located in the Southeast, Northeast, and Northwest quadrants of the nation's capital. Three components provide probation supervision and a myriad of innovative psycho-educational services to male youths and their families by way of consent decrees of disposition sentencing. One component provides intensive probation supervision and psycho-educational services to high-risk youth located throughout the city. One component provides probation supervision and psycho-educational services to District youths adjudicated in neighboring jurisdictions. The For All Inspired Through Hope (FAITH) component is a pilot initiative encompassing an exclusive female adolescent probation supervision component and providing a full array of support services including: intake, pre-trial, diagnostic, supervision, and transitional services. The Branch has 51 FTEs.
- The Delinquency Prevention Unit is a pilot initiative designed to divert low-to-moderate risk youths from secure detention and returning youths home prior to the determination to petition. The initiative is also responsible for providing pre-trial community-based services to youth diverted from secure detention, and assisting in the safe retrieval of youth in abscondence, subsequent to the issuance of a custody order. The unit has 7 FTEs.
- The Juvenile Drug Court Treatment Unit manages the internal and external delivery of developmentally appropriate substance abuse treatment services to youths and families involved in the juvenile drug court and post-disposition youths. The unit interfaces with stakeholders governing the actual Juvenile Drug Court (JDC) encompassing: the judge, defense attorneys, prosecutors, probation officers, treatment counselor, family members, the Department of Health's Addiction Prevention and Recovery Administration (APRA) and service providers. The Unit has 5 FTEs
- The Education/Vocation Coordinator coordinates all educational and vocational tutoring and referrals for youths under the division's supervision. The coordinator oversees the provision of supplemental educational and vocational services at the main office and each satellite office. This service is facilitated by 1 FTE.



- The Contract Monitoring and Purchase of Services Unit coordinates all court ordered referrals and oversees the delivery of services and coordination of reimbursement for services provided by 25 vendors contracted to serve supervised youths and families. The unit has 4 FTEs.
- The Juvenile Information Control Unit processes all cases closed through the use of the Court's Courtview database and coordinates all mail correspondences for the division. The Unit has 5 FTEs.

### **Division Management Action Plan (MAP) Objectives**

The Social Services Division will:

- Enhance informed judicial decision-making in the Family Court by conducting detailed assessments on delinquents and, providing information (e.g., data, recommendations) to judges via comprehensive pre-trial and pre-sentence reports and participation in court hearings.
- Deliver juvenile probation services necessary to rehabilitate youth, lower recidivism and protect the community.
- Provide high-quality juvenile probation services that will increase successful completion of probation supervision by 5% per year.
- Deliver juvenile probation services that effectively protect the community by reducing the percentage of positive drug test among juveniles.
- Enhance proficiency and retention of highly skilled employees through the development and implementation of mandatory core competency-training curriculum for staff.
- Provide consistent and uniform performance among staffs by updating and distributing the Standard Practices Manual bi-annually.
- Develop and implement procedures to ensure all staffs comply with the policies developed by the Division and Court.
- Develop and implement procedures ensuring all managers and supervisors conduct case reviews in compliance with the Divisions' procedures.

### **Restructuring or Work Process Re-Design:**

In FY 2005, the Social Services Division experienced an increase in the number of youths supervised from an average of 1,500 youths (in FY 2004) to an average of 1,900 youths, and an

increase in the volume of court ordered wraparound services resulting in the Court redirecting funds to support the Division in fulfilling its mission. In FY 2006, the Division anticipates an increase in the number of youth supervised and an increase in the volume of court ordered referrals (including a high volume of psychological and psychiatric evaluations).

To address the increased number of youths supervised in FY 2005, the Division redeployed staff managing small caseloads to satellite probation supervision offices to reduce the high volume of cases supervised. Prior to this effort, many probation officers in satellite offices managed caseloads ranging from 45 to 50 youths. Following the redeployment of staff, probation officer caseloads were dropped to an average of 35 youths, only five cases over the national recommended average of 30 cases. In addition, the Division instituted evening curfew monitoring for all pre and post-adjudicated youth mandated to adhere to court ordered evening curfews to reduce recidivism among supervised youths. The Division also redeployed support staff to create an educational outreach effort (Delinquency Prevention) designed to provide pro-social pre-trial support to youths and educate parents, clergy, schools, and community members about the juvenile justice system and collaboration with the Division's efforts. The Division also re-engineered two management positions to create four FTEs encompassing two drug treatment counselors and two deputy clerks.

The Division continued to operate two pilot initiatives effectively institutionalized in FY 2005 including: the Delinquency Prevention Unit designed to divert low-to-moderate risk youth from pre-trial detention, provide pre-trial services and assist in the retrieval of youths in abscondence and noncompliant with their probation plan/agreement and, the female adolescent continuum of care probation supervision component. Creation of this Unit required the Division to redeploy probation officers from existing responsibilities in order to coordinate a "state of the art" continuum for female adolescents.

In FY 2006, the Division will complete phase one of a two-year strategic plan to convert all satellite offices into comprehensive one-stop-shop "Drop-In Centers. In FY 2006, the Division will work closely with the Court's Administrative Services Division staff to assess the scope of services and rate of reimbursement for all contractual services. In FY 2006, the Division will begin issuing new RFPs and procure a higher volume of services, primarily provided in the Drop-In Centers.

As national data show a steady increase in juvenile arrest rates, the Division has assessed its capacity to adequately serve and supervise delinquents and assist in protecting the public. Data detailed in the FY 2007 Funding Request section underscores essential resources the Division requires to meet its objectives, thereby supporting the mission of the Court.

## **Workload Data**

Table 1  
**SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION**  
Caseload (Fiscal Year 2004 data)

Case Type	New Cases	Cases Closed	Cases Pending Start of Year	Cases Pending End of Year	Change in Pending Cases
Juvenile Intake	2163	2050	442	555	25.6%
Diagnostic	612	514	252	350	38.9%
Juvenile Drug Court	30	28	25	27	8.0%
Juvenile Supervision	996	922	858	870	1.4%

Table 2  
**SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION**  
**Key Performance Indicators**

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimate FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Input	Juveniles under supervision and Domestic Relations cases	Court data	1,751	1,794	1,839	1,889
Output/Activity	Juveniles under supervision and drug tests conducted	Pretrial Services Data	5,165	5,180	5,190	5,198
Output/Activity	Juveniles successfully completing probation	Division Statistical Reports	875	895	915	938
Outcome	Juvenile probationers testing positive for drugs while on probation	Pretrial Services Data	52%	47%	42%	37%
Outcome	Juvenile who commit new offenses while under probation supervision	Annual statistics	30%	25%	20%	15%

## **FY 2007 Request**

In FY 2007, the request for the Social Services Division is \$14,218,000, an increase of \$907,000 (7%) above the FY 2006 Enacted level. This increase consists of \$100,000 to purchase additional court ordered community-based wraparound services and \$792,000 for built-in costs.

### ***Wraparound Services for Youth, \$100,000***

The Division is responsible for all juvenile probation supervision services for the District of Columbia. For decades, wraparound services procured by the Division have enabled probation officers to enhance supervision of youth in the community and lower recidivism. Wraparound services are an array of community-based services provided in the least restrictive setting for youths and families. These services include, but are not limited to: mentoring, tutoring, educational/vocational assessments and advocacy, life skills, parenting skills, equestrian therapy, and individual and family counseling. Prior to FY 2002, the average number of youth supervised daily was roughly 1,200. However, during the past three years, the daily average number of youths supervised continued to rise. In FY 2006, the Division projects it will supervise an average 1,900 youths daily. The high volume projected is based on a steady increase in the number of youths supervised from FY 2002 thru FY 2005. The projected increase in resources necessary to procure services for supervised youths is attributed to the anticipated increase in court ordered services including evaluations (e.g., psychological, psychiatric evaluations) and wraparound services to supervise youths throughout the community: self esteem/mentoring, tutoring, advocacy, life-skills, parenting skills, and individual and family counseling for youths.

Absent additional funds requested, probation officers will likely experience increased delays in the timely delivery of court ordered services. Consequently, the duration of court ordered probation will be extended. Probation officers will also likely experience-increased caseloads due to longer periods of probation for youths. Fewer face-to-face truancy checks as well as curfew monitoring will be conducted on supervised youths. The Division will not be able to upgrade current electronic monitoring equipment from passive surveillance units (which do not permit real time tracking for movement beyond inclusion and exclusion zones) to the more effective global positioning system (GPS) units. Ultimately, the Division will not be able to effectively monitor youths in the community.

### ***Funds Requested***

The Social Services Division requests \$100,000 to secure the following services for youths under court ordered probation supervision:

• Self Esteem/Mentoring services	\$21,000
• Individual Counseling services	\$13,000
• Psychological and Psychiatric evaluations	\$15,000
• Family Counseling services	\$ 8,800
• Tutoring & Educational Advocacy Services	
○ Group Sessions	\$10,800
○ Individual Sessions	\$ 4,500
○ Educational Advocacy	\$ 4,500
• Life Skills & Parent Skills services	\$ 7,900
• GPS “Real Time” Electronic Monitoring	\$14,500

Problem Statement - The Social Services Division has assessed the volume of services provided to youths supervised over the past five years and determined that the amount of funds appropriated annually did not provide adequate support necessary for the Division to achieve its objectives. The Division has reviewed current data trends released by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), the Coalition for Juvenile Justice (CJJ), Child Welfare League of America (CWLA), the American Correctional Association (ACA), and the arrest rates from the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD), and determined that as the rate of juvenile delinquency rises, additional resources are necessary to ensure that juveniles are appropriately supervised.

All indicators underscore that supervising delinquent youths through the use of community-based wraparound services and graduated sanctions (which encompass services and mediation between adolescent offenders and victims of delinquent offenses) are the most effective way to reduce recidivism. Additional data shows that absent wraparound community-based services, standard probation supervision cannot stem the tide of rising rates of juvenile delinquency. To the contrary, data shows that absent access to such services jurisdictions rely heavily on extended stays in secure detention resulting in greater recidivism among adolescents upon release.

Relationship to Court Vision, Mission and Goals. The funding requested to permit the Division access to enhanced services for youths under probation supervision bodes appropriately with the Courts' strategic goals:

- Administering justice fairly and efficiently and enhancing public safety.
- Broadening access to justice and service to the public.
- Building trust and confidence among the public.

Relationship to Division Objectives. Self esteem/mentoring, individual and family counseling, tutoring and educational advocacy, life-skills and parenting skills and GPS Electronic Monitoring provide the Division with an array of viable alternatives to secure detention. Moreover these wraparound services enable the Division to ensure: (1) judicial decision-making occurs in a timely manner consistent with national standards; (2) timely delivery of pre-trial, diversion and disposition services; and (3) promote public safety through the use of graduated sanctions and development of inclusion and exclusion zones tracked by portable devices monitored by probation officers and supervisors.

Relationship to Existing Funding. The Court has analyzed non-personal services (NPS) funding allocations to the Division over the past five fiscal years. The Court has determined that controlling for inflation, the Division experienced no-growth funding for nearly a decade. The Court has also determined that inadequate funding has compromised the extent to which objectives have been met. In FY 2005, the Division re-deployed staff, refined programming and supervision and initiated several new program initiatives to complement juvenile probation supervision; unfortunately, the volume of youths supervised continues to exceed the volume of services and supports currently available. The Division also modified its use of three contracts comprising the lion-share of NPS funds.

Additional resources requested will enable the Division to meet the needs of delinquent youths in a timely manner. These resources will also enable the Division to better manage the high volume of youths supervised resulting in greater compliance among youths with probation supervision, increased participation among parents assisting in the supervision of their youths and lower rate of recidivism among probation youths.

**Methodology.** The Division has assessed the average costs for services proposed through the use of additional funding requested. The Division has determined the average costs for services proposed and will procure services in accordance with proportionate rates. The Division has also assessed the scope and volume of services proposed through the use of additional funds and determined that these services will effectively augment the Division's efforts. This determination is based on the average daily number of 1900 youths supervised by probation officers in FY 2005 and the average caseload managed by probation officer in excess of national standards.

**Expenditure Plan.** As indicated in the Restructuring or "Work Process Re-Design" section of this budget, the division will reprioritized the scope of each contract in FY 2006. The Division will also move from utilizing contracts distinguished by vacillating costs for services and establish rates consistent with cost averages throughout the city. The Division has calculated the amount of funds obligated for each service category and will monitor its use of funds over a twelve (12) month spending plan. Table 3 details the volume of services the Division will procure to assist in supervising and serving delinquent youth throughout FY 2007.

<b>Service</b>	<b># of Youth Served</b>	<b>Average Unit Cost</b>	<b># of Service Sessions</b>	<b>Total Cost for Additional Services</b>
Self Esteem/Mentoring	30 youth	\$35	20 session, per youth	\$21,000
Individual Counseling	25 youth	\$65	10 sessions per youth	\$13,000
Psychological, Psycho-Educational & Psychiatric Evaluations.	20 youth	\$750	20 evaluations	\$15,000
Family Counseling	10 families	\$110	8 sessions per family	\$ 8,800
Tutoring Group Services	108 groups	\$100	10 youth per group	\$10,800
Tutoring Individual Services	15 youth	\$30	10 sessions per youth	\$ 4,500
Educational Advocacy	10 youth	\$35	4 sessions per youth	\$ 4,500
Life-Skills & Parent Skills	15 youth and 15 families	\$35	7 sessions per youth and parent(s)	\$ 7,900
GPS Electronic Monitoring	20 additional units	\$725	N/A	\$14,500

**Performance Indicators.** In FY 2005, the Division observed an average 30-45 day delay in placing youths in court ordered services. The Division also assessed that the low volume of service sessions approved did not permit consistent contact between the youth and service provider to the benefit of youths, families and the public. This delay was due, in part, to an aggressive effort to preserve funding over the Fiscal Year, and serve a larger number of youth. Additional funds requested will permit the Division to secure pre-trial, adjudication and post-disposition services for youth in a timely manner resulting in a greater number of youth

completing probation supervision absent recidivism and repeated stays in secure detention. Key performance indicators anticipated include:

- Increased parent participation resulting in greater supervision of probation youth
- Reduction in curfew violations
- Reduction in truancy and poor school attendance
- Increased academic performances
- Reduction in auto theft among youths adjudicated for unauthorized use of a vehicle (UUV)
- Increased compliance among youths with probation supervision agreement
- Reduction in the number of youths testing positive for drugs
- Reduction in drug re-arrest for drug distribution
- Reduction in number youths remanded to secure detention
- Reduction in the average length of stay among (ALOS) youth remanded to secure detention

The Division will measure the success of these outcomes by tracking the volume of recidivism, truancy, extended periods of probation supervision, and compliance with drug screenings. The Division will also track the number of youth who successfully complete probation supervision during the probation plan/agreement and the number of early case closures.

Table 3  
**SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION**  
**Budget Authority by Object Class**

	<b>FY 2005 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2006 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2007 Request</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	8,820,000	9,116,000	9,734,000	618,000
12 - Benefits	2,102,000	2,188,000	2,336,000	148,000
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<i>10,922,000</i>	<i>11,304,000</i>	<i>12,070,000</i>	<i>766,000</i>
21 – Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	1,167,000	1,949,000	2,088,000	139,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	28,000	28,000	29,000	1,000
31 – Equipment	30,000	30,000	31,000	1,000
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<i>1,225,000</i>	<i>2,007,000</i>	<i>2,148,000</i>	<i>141,000</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12,147,000</b>	<b>13,311,000</b>	<b>14,218,000</b>	<b>907,000</b>
FTE	133	1,949,000	2,088,000	139,000

Table 4  
**SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION**  
**Detail, Difference FY 2006/2007**

Object Class	Description of Request	FTE	Cost	Difference FY 2006/2007
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIGS	133	308,000	
	Current Positions COLA	133	310,000	
Subtotal				618,000
12 - Benefits	Current Positions WIGS	133	74,000	
	Current Positions COLA	133	74,000	
Subtotal				148,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	Wraparound Services		100,000	
	Built-in		39,000	
Subtotal				139,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			1,000
31 - Equipment	Built-in			1,000
Total				907,000

Table 5  
**SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION**  
**Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment**

	2005 Actual	2006 Enacted	2007 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	4	4	4
JS-7	6	6	6
JS-8	18	18	18
JS-9	5	5	5
JS-10	2	2	2
JS-11	1	1	1
JS-12	71	71	71
JS-13	20	20	20
JS-14	4	4	4
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	8,820,000	9,116,000	9,734,000
Total	133	133	133



**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT  
MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION**

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
20	2,216,000	20	2,280,000	20	2,375,000	0	95,000

**Mission Statement**

The mission of the Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division is to facilitate the fast, efficient, and fair settlement of disputes through the use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR).

**Organizational Background**

The Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division (“Multi-Door”) provides mediation and other ADR services to assist in the settlement of disputes brought to the D.C. Courts. The individual who serves as the mediator, arbitrator, evaluator, or conciliator is identified as a neutral. The neutral is responsible for facilitating agreement or resolution. The Division is comprised of the Director’s office and three branches: Civil ADR; Family ADR; and Program Assessment.

1. The Civil ADR Branch provides binding and non-binding arbitration, mediation, or neutral case evaluation for most of the Court’s civil cases. Mediation also is provided for small claims cases, landlord and tenant cases, complex civil matters, and probate and tax assessment cases.
2. The Family ADR Branch includes three programs that serve Family Court: Child Protection Mediation, Community Information and Referral, and Family Mediation. Child Protection Mediation addresses service plan and legal issues in child neglect cases. The Community Information and Referral Program provides resource information, agency referrals, conciliation, and mediation to individuals and families. The program addresses landlord-tenant, consumer fraud, contract, domestic relations, and personal injury issues before a case is filed. The Family Mediation Program addresses domestic relations issues of custody, support, visitation, and property distribution.
3. The Program Assessment Branch provides quality assurance through the training, evaluation, and support of 350 community-based neutrals who are lawyers, social workers, government employees, retirees, and others providing ADR services to the community. Multi-Door staff also provides program information and technical assistance to international and domestic judges, lawyers, government officials, and court administrators (usually under the sponsorship of USIA or AID) who seek to establish or improve ADR programs in their own jurisdictions.

Table 1  
**MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION**  
**Caseload Overview**

	Cases Referred	ADR Performed	Cases Closed	Cases Settled	Settlement Rate
FY 2004	7,580	5,250	6,278	2,840	54%
FY 2005	6,920	5,220	6,100	2,600	50%

### **Division Objectives/MAP Objectives**

Multi-Door's division objectives are summarized as follows:

- ***Quality*** – ADR services will be of the highest possible quality;
- ***Responsiveness*** – ADR services will be delivered efficiently; and
- ***Settlement*** – ADR services will facilitate settlement of cases filed at Superior Court.

These objectives are quantified through annual target goals that are measured through caseload and qualitative performance measures. The “settlement” objective is measured through quantitative caseload measures (cases referred, ADR performed, cases closed, cases settled, and settlement rate); the “responsiveness” and “quality” objectives are measured through quality performance indicators of ADR process, outcome, and neutral performance. These quality indicators measure client satisfaction through user surveys implemented at the end of FY 2001, and revised in FY 2004.

Multi-Door assembled a team of staff in FY 2004 to develop a management action plan (MAP). This division MAP includes objectives that align with and serve both the three division objectives as well as the D.C. Courts' Strategic Plan. Multi-Door's objectives follow:

- Provide prompt and efficient justice by developing and implementing time standards for processing cases in all ADR programs.
- Provide disputants an alternative to litigation to attain justice, by delivering ADR programs that settle, on average, at least 50% of cases, and maintain a client satisfaction rate of 80% or better.
- Provide *pro se* litigants with access to quality agreements by developing family mediation agreement-writing software and agreement language to enable quick and comprehensive agreements.
- Enhance public access to ADR services by updating and revising informational brochures for all Multi-Door programs and translating them into Spanish.
- Enhance staff and neutrals' performance by developing and distributing comprehensive policies and procedures handbooks.

- Promote effective mediator panels through a comprehensive program of recruitment, screening, selection, training, mentoring, evaluation, and support.
- Promote well-trained neutrals by instituting an in-service training plan to develop knowledge, skills, and experience to further develop mediator performance.

### **Division Restructuring or Work Process Redesign**

Multi-Door is redesigning its major business processes – case management/scheduling, neutrals management, statistical reporting, and financial management/reporting – in conjunction with the development of the Integrated Justice Information Systems (IJIS) project. Multi-Door has participated in the implementation of every wave of the IJIS implementation to date, and has completed redesign of case management and neutrals management processes for all programs. The new business processes provide greater consistency throughout the division's ADR programs and are better integrated with the case management of the D.C. Courts, providing more timely and comprehensive access to data that results in more effective ADR service delivery. When complete, the redesign of the statistical reporting processes will be better integrated with that of the D.C. Courts. The final element to be completed, financial management and reporting, will result in a system that is more efficient for both staff and mediators, as the voucher payment system is converted to an internet-based system which eliminates the need for inefficient duplication of data entry and provides improved access to neutrals for verifying payment information and tracking payment progress.

### **Workload Data**

Table 2  
**MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION**  
**Civil ADR Programs**  
**Performance Measurement Table**

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimated FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Input	Cases referred	Multi-Door & IT databases	5,186	5,100	5,000	5,000
Output	ADR performed	Multi-Door database	4,275	4,300	4,250	4,280
Outcome	Case settlement rate	Multi-Door database	48%	44%	46%	48%
Outcome/Quality	Process Performance	SPSS database	95%	92%	93%	95%
Outcome/Quality	Outcome Satisfaction	SPSS database	84%	87%	89%	90%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral Performance	SPSS database	96%	94%	95%	95%

Table 3  
**MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION**  
**Family ADR Programs**  
**Performance Measurement Table**

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimated FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Input	Cases referred	Multi-Door database	2,394	1,820*	2,002	2,247
Output	ADR performed	Multi-Door database	917	970	1,068	1,175
Outcome	Case settlement rate	Multi-Door database	69%	58%	60%	62%
Outcome/Quality	Process Performance	SPSS database	94%	96%	98%	98%
Outcome/Quality	Outcome Satisfaction	SPSS database	89%	91%	93%	95%
Outcome/Quality	Neutral Performance	SPSS database	95%	97%	98%	98%

\*Referrals have decreased most significantly in family mediation, perhaps due to the creation of the case evaluation program as an alternative referral.

The quality performance elements reported in the charts above are measured through participant surveys distributed to all ADR participants. The statistics report the percentage of respondents who report being either “satisfied” or “highly satisfied” with the overall ADR process, outcome, and neutral performance.

### **Key Performance Indicators**

Multi-Door will continue to exercise best efforts to achieve its objectives of quality, responsiveness, and settlement in ADR service delivery. The Division has identified performance goals to achieve these objectives. These performance goals are—1) to achieve settlement rates of at least 50% in every ADR program; and 2) to achieve ratings of “highly satisfied” from at least 35% of respondents in each of the three quality performance indicators (ADR process, ADR outcome, and neutral performance) and overall satisfaction rates (a combination of “satisfied” and “highly satisfied” responses) of at least 50%. Key performance indicators drawn from the Multi-Door MAP are as follows:

Table 4  
Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division  
Key Performance Indicators

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimate FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Output	Achieve settlement of 50% of cases	IJIS database	54%	50%	50%	52%
Outcome	Achieve overall client satisfaction of 80% *	SPSS database	73%	78%	80%	80%
Outcome	Achieve client high satisfaction of 35% *	SPSS database	34%	35%	36%	36%
Output	Achieve 70%* compliance with case processing time standards	SPSS database	Development	70%	71%	72%

\*The target for combined satisfaction ratings (“satisfied” plus “highly satisfied”) is 80%.

The above quality performance indicators are measured through participant surveys distributed to all participants in Multi-Door ADR processes. Responses are tabulated monthly and reported with caseload statistical measures. The statistics report the percentage of respondents who report being either “satisfied” or “highly satisfied” with the overall ADR process, outcome, and neutral performance.

### **FY 2007 Request**

In FY 2007, the D.C. Courts request \$2,375,000 for the Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division, an increase of \$95,000 (4%) above the FY 2006 Enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in increases.

Table 6  
**MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION**  
**Budget Authority by Object Class**

	<b>FY 2005 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2006 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2007 Request</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	1,306,000	1,350,000	1,415,000	65,000
12 - Benefits	313,000	324,000	340,000	16,000
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<b>1,619,000</b>	<b>1,674,000</b>	<b>1,755,000</b>	<b>81,000</b>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	587,000	596,000	610,000	14,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	6,000	6,000	6,000	0
31 – Equipment	4,000	4,000	4,000	0
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<b>597,000</b>	<b>606,000</b>	<b>620,000</b>	<b>14,000</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,216,000</b>	<b>2,280,000</b>	<b>2,375,000</b>	<b>95,000</b>
FTE	20	20	20	0

Table 7  
**MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION**  
**Detail, Difference FY 2006/2007**

<b>Object Class</b>	<b>Description of Request</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIGS	20	19,000	
	Current Positions COLA	20	46,000	
Subtotal				65,000
12 - Benefits	Current Positions WIGS	20	5,000	
	Current Positions COLA	20	11,000	
Subtotal				16,000
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service	Built-in			14,000
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment				
Total				95,000

Table 8  
**MULTI-DOOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION DIVISION**  
**Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment**

	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Enacted</b>	<b>2007 Request</b>
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8	1	1	1
JS-9	2	2	2
JS-10	7	7	7
JS-11	5	4	4
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13	4	4	4
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	1,306,000	1,350,000	1,415,000
Total	20	20	20

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT  
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER**

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
3	267,000	3	271,000	3	321,000	0	50,000

The mission of the Office of the Auditor-Master is to assist the Judiciary and parties in actions filed in the D.C. Courts expeditiously to state accounts for persons under the authority of the Court and to resolve controversies involving complex financial computations and transactions in the Civil, Probate, and Tax Divisions and Family Court.

The principal role of the Auditor-Master is to state accounts, determine the value of assets and liabilities, and make other complex financial calculations where no agreement has been reached among the parties, thus conserving judicial time and resources. The Auditor-Master is also available to assist the Judiciary by presiding over discovery and settlement negotiations and other pretrial issues, as well as post-trial monitoring of judgments, consent decrees, and settlements in complex civil litigation. The Auditor-Master presides over hearings, takes testimony, issues subpoenas as needed, and establishes such record as is necessary.

**Organizational Background**

The position of the Auditor-Master was created in accordance with the D.C. Official Code §11-1724. The Office of the Auditor-Master currently consists of three FTEs: the Auditor-Master, the Assistant to the Auditor-Master, and an Administrative Assistant.

**Divisional MAP Objectives**

The objectives of the Office of the Auditor-Master are as follows:

- Objective 1. Ensure the timely processing of non-complex cases referred to the Office of the Auditor-Master by disposing of at least 80% of these cases within 120 days and 95% of the cases within 180 days of referral in FY 2007.
- Objective 2. Ensure the timely processing of complex cases referred to the Office of the Auditor-Master by disposing at least 70% of these cases within 180 days and 95% of the cases within 270 days of referral in FY 2007.
- Objective 3. Enhance efficient case management, reporting and accounting in the office of the auditor-master by developing and implementing data collection and statistical reporting procedures in FY 2007.

- Objective 4. Increase the use of the Office of the Auditor-Master by continuing to educate the Judiciary, Bar, and public on the function and utilization of the Office by conducting informational meetings with Civil, Family, Probate and Tax Court Judges and by developing informational pamphlets for judicial officers and court participants in FY 2007.

Table 1  
**OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER**  
**Caseload Overview**

	Actual FY 2004	Estimated FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Pending Oct. 1	125	41	25	25
New Orders of Reference	9	52	84	84
Total for disposition	134	93	109	109
Dispositions	93	68	84	84
Pending Sept. 30	41	25	25	25

Table 2  
**OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER**  
**Key Performance Indicators**

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimated FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Input	New Orders of Reference Plus Prior Year Carryover	Quarterly Reports	134	93	109	109
Output	Cases resolved	Quarterly Reports	93	68	84	84
Outcome	Noncomplex Orders of Reference resolved in < 120 days	Quarterly Reports	100%	85%	80%	80%
Outcome	Noncomplex Orders of Reference resolved in < 180 days	Quarterly Reports	100%	95%	95%	95%
Outcome	Complex Orders of Reference resolved in < 180 days	Quarterly Reports	100%	80%	70%	70%
Outcome	Complex Orders of Reference resolved in < 270 days	Quarterly Reports	100%	90%	95%	95%

### **FY 2007 Request**

For FY 2007, the D.C. Courts request \$331,000 for the Office of the Auditor-Master, an increase of \$50,000 (18%) above the FY 2006 Enacted level. The increase consists of \$34,000 to fully fund existing positions and \$16,000 for built-in cost increases.



Table 3  
**OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER**  
**Budget Authority by Object Class**

	<b>FY 2005 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2006 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2007 Request</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	204,000	209,000	248,000	39,000
12 - Benefits	51,000	50,000	60,000	10,000
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<i>255,000</i>	<i>259,000</i>	<i>308,000</i>	<i>49,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services	2,000	2,000	2,000	0
26 - Supplies & Materials	2,000	2,000	2,000	0
31 - Equipment	8,000	8,000	9,000	1,000
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<i>12,000</i>	<i>12,000</i>	<i>13,000</i>	<i>1,000</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	267,000	271,000	321,000	50,000
<b>FTE</b>	3	3	3	0

Table 4  
**OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER**  
**Detail Difference, FY 2006/ 2007**

<b>Object Class</b>	<b>Description of Request</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	Current Positions WIGS	3	4,000	
	Current Positions COLA	3	8,000	
	Shortage	3	27,000	
Subtotal				39,000
12 - Benefits	Current Positions WIGS	3	1,000	
	Current Positions COLA	3	2,000	
	Shortage	3	7,000	
Subtotal				10,000
21 - Travel, Transp. Of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials				
31 - Equipment	Built-in		9,000	1,000
Total				50,000

Table 5  
**OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-MASTER**  
**Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment**

	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Enacted</b>	<b>2007 Request</b>
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6			
JS-7			
JS-8			
JS-9	1	1	1
JS-10			
JS-11			
JS-12	1	1	1
JS-13			
JS-14			
JS-15			
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	204,000	209,000	248,000
Total	3	3	3

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT  
PROBATE DIVISION/OFFICE OF THE REGISTER OF WILLS**

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
45	3,524,000	45	3,662,000	50	4,252,000	5	590,000

**Mission Statement**

The mission of the Probate Division/Office of the Register of Wills is to fairly, promptly and effectively record and maintain wills and case proceedings, monitor supervised estates of decedents, minors and incapacitated adults, audit fiduciary accounts and review and make recommendations to judges on all *ex parte* filings, in matters over which the Superior Court has probate jurisdiction.

**Introduction**

The Probate Division/Office of the Register of Wills has jurisdiction over decedents' estates, trusts, guardianships of minors, and guardianships and conservatorships of incapacitated adults. The organizational components are the Office of the Register of Wills and two branches, Probate Operations and Auditing and Appraisals.

**Organizational Background**

The Probate Division is comprised of the Office of the Register of Wills and two branches.

- The Office of the Register of Wills consists of the Register of Wills, who is responsible for the management and supervision of the two branches and four deputies, whose primary duties are to review pleadings and prepare recommendations to the judges on uncontested matters, advise attorneys and the general public on procedures, and appear at hearings to ensure fiduciaries comply with reporting requirements. The Office has two administrative support positions for a total of 7 FTEs.
- The Probate Operations Branch is comprised of three sections, the Small Estates section, which processes petitions in decedents' estates having assets of \$40,000 or less; the Decedents Estates and Guardianships of Minors section, which processes decedents' estates with assets valued in excess of \$40,000 and guardianships of minors; and the Interventions and Trusts section, which processes guardianships and conservatorships of incapacitated adults and trusts. This branch has 21 FTEs.
- The Auditing and Appraisals Branch audits accounts of fiduciaries under court supervision, examines requests for compensation, prepares audit reports, advises

attorneys and fiduciaries on accounting procedures and conducts appraisals of tangible property. This branch has 17 FTEs.

### **Division MAP Objectives**

The Probate Division 2005 – 2007 Management Action Plan, MAP, includes the following objectives:

- Ensure timely case processing by updating Program Performance Standards for all case types to fully incorporate CourtView functionality, and monitor performance to achieve at least 95% compliance with time standards for all case processing activities.
- Ensure consistent performance of case processing functions by developing Standard Operating Procedures and Quality Assurance Protocols for each CourtView function, providing staff training, and monitoring compliance beginning March 31, 2005.
- Enhance access to justice by Spanish-speaking court users by creating and disseminating informational materials that explain the probate process in Spanish, i.e., *When Someone Dies*, *Record Keeping and Filing Duties*, *Small Estate Proceedings*, *Guardianship and Conservatorship of Adults*, *Opening a Probate Proceeding*, *General Information Concerning Small Estates*, *Conservatorship Information Sheet*, and *Guardianship of Minors Information Sheet*.
- Enhance the electronic availability of Probate Division materials by collaborating with the Court's webmaster to include on the Court's website existing accounting forms for guardianships, conservatorships and trusts, the Probate Training Manuals, and the Fiduciary Accounting Guide.
- Increase public awareness and community understanding of probate operations and procedures by participating in at least two community workshops and seminars each year.

### **Divisional Restructuring and/or Work Process Redesign**

An integrated case management system, the Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS), was fully implemented in the Probate Division during May 2004 under Wave 2 of the Courts' IJIS Project. Work processes were redesigned to enhance efficiencies and to fully utilize the IJIS functionality.

### **Workload Data**

As shown in Table 1, below, the Probate Division disposed of 3,101 cases in fiscal year 2004, including 48 conservatorships, 117 foreign proceedings, 1,726 formal probate, 161 guardianships, 304 interventions, 741 small estates, and 4 trusts.

Table 1  
**PROBATE DIVISION**  
**Caseload and Efficiency Measures**  
**(Fiscal Year 2004 data)**

	<u>Cases Added</u>	<u>Cases Disposed</u>	<u>Clearance Rate*</u>	<u>Cases Pending 1-Oct</u>	<u>30-Sep</u>	<u>Change</u>
Conservatorships	-	48	-	300	252	-16%
Foreign Proceedings	117	117	100%	-	-	-
Formal Probate	1,491	1,726	116%	4,246	4,011	-6%
Guardianships	44	161	366%	358	241	-33%
Interventions	322	304	94%	1,862	1,880	1%
Small Estates	678	741	118%	142	79	-44%
Trusts	11	4	36%	278	285	3%
<b>Total</b>	2,663	3,101	119%	7,186	6,748	-6%

\* Ratio of cases disposed to cases filed in a given year. A standard efficiency measure is 100%, meaning one case disposed for each case filed.

### **Key Performance Indicators**

Table 2  
**PROBATE DIVISION**  
**Key Performance Indicators**

Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimate FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Submit to judges recommendations on disposition of <i>ex parte</i> petitions within 14 days of ripeness.	Random Case Review	80%	93%	95%	95%
Issue letters of conservatorship on date of qualification of conservator for adults	Random Case Review	55%	95%	95%	95%
Issue letters of administration within 7 days of filing of petition for probate or petition for appointment of guardian of minor	Random Case Review	99%	95%	95%	95%
Schedule hearing on petition for appointment of guardian or conservator within 35 days of filing	Random Case Review	99%	98%	95%	95%
Dispose of small estates within 120 days of filing	Random Case Review	65%	75%	95%	95%
Issue delinquency notices within 14 days of delinquency and issue summary hearing notices, if necessary, within 14 days of delinquency notice.	Random Case Review	85%	95%	95%	100%
Docket pleadings and orders and mail orders within 1 day of receipt in the clerk's office	Random Case Review	80%	98%	95%	95%
Submit accounts for disposition within 90 days of filing	Monthly Reports	48%	50%	75%	75%
Review requests for compensation from private funds within 45 days of filing	Monthly Reports	75%	92%	95%	95%
Review requests for compensation from guardianship fund within 30 days of filing	Monthly Reports	92%	98%	95%	N/A

### **FY 2007 Request**

In FY 2007 the Courts request \$4,252,000 for the Probate Division, an increase of \$590,000 (16.1) above the FY 2006 Enacted level. The requested increase includes \$404,000 for 5 FTEs to enhance the timely disposition of probate cases; and \$186,000 for built-in increases.

#### ***Expediting Case Audits and Reviews, \$348,000***

***FTE Request - Auditing and Appraisals Branch, three Auditors, JS-12  
One Supervisory Auditor, JS-13***

Problem Statement. To protect and monitor the estates and assets of minor children, incapacitated adults and deceased persons, the Probate Division requests funds for four FTEs. Current staffing in the Auditing Branch is inadequate to provide timely completion of requests for compensation and account dispositions. Delays in dispositions of accounts and requests for compensation can result in lengthy and costly administration of estates and hardship to minor children, incapacitated adults, and beneficiaries of decedents estates and trusts. Additional staff will enable the Auditing Branch to timely process the fiduciary accounts and requests for compensation, thereby improving services and reducing costs for children, incapacitated adults, and the beneficiaries of decedents' estates. One Supervisory Auditor and three Auditor positions are requested to dispose of fiduciary accountings within 90 days of filing in 75% of cases and complete reviews of requests for compensation from private funds within 45 days of filing in 95% of cases by end of FY 2007.

Relationship to Strategic Issues, Goals or Strategies. The addition of three auditors and one supervisory auditor will enable the timely and accurate processing and disposition of requests for compensation from private funds and fiduciary accounts, supporting the Courts' mission to protect the rights and liberties of minor children, incapacitated adults, and beneficiaries of decedents estates and trusts. It is aligned with the Courts' Strategic Issue 1, Goal 1.1.1 to administer justice promptly and efficiently and Goal 1.5.1 to enhance the administration of justice by assessing resource needs necessary to accomplish the Courts' mission.

Relationship to Division MAP Objectives. The FY 2007 request for additional auditors supports Probate Division MAP Objectives 1.1.1 and 1.5.1 to ensure timely case processing and to seek additional human resources to dispose of fiduciary accountings within 90 days of filing and to review requests for compensation from private funds within 45 days of filing. This objective is in alignment with the Courts strategic goal to institute case management plans and utilize best practices and time standards.

Relationship to Existing Funding. There are currently 17 FTEs in the Auditing & Appraisals Branch of the Probate Division, consisting of one Branch Manager, one Supervisory Auditor, one Appraiser, one Deputy Clerk, and 13 Auditors. Because the work of the 13 auditors requires detailed supervisory scrutiny, they are divided into two teams with seven reporting to the Supervisory Auditor and six reporting directly to the Branch Manager. The Appraiser and the Deputy Clerk II also report directly to the Branch Manager. The Branch annually audits approximately 2,200 fiduciary accounts preparing substantive written reports for judicial consideration; and reviews approximately 1,600 petitions for compensation preparing written analyses. The additional human resources would allow auditors to more promptly dispose of accounts and petitions for compensation, thereby resulting in timely case processing and enhanced public service. The addition of a Supervisory Auditor will provide direct supervision for one of the two teams of auditors that currently reports directly to the Branch Manager. That would extend time to the Branch Manager to concentrate on managerial responsibilities. The lack of funding in this area will result in continuing delays in dispositions of accounts and requests for compensation escalating the expense in the administration of estates under court supervision.

Methodology. The proposed grade levels of the additional FTEs are consistent with the Courts' personnel policies. The additional human resources would allow more cases annually to be processed within established time standards based upon a product efficiency rate of 235 matters approved annually per FTE (19 monthly approvals per auditor).

Currently, 13 auditors process approximately 4,400 accounts and fee requests, or 338 matters each, leaving a deficit in the efficiency rate of nearly 27% of accountings (756) not disposed of within 90 days of filing. Our current rate of accounts disposed within 90 days of filing is 48% (1,344), which is considerably low in comparison to the Division MAP goal of 75%.

To achieve the goal of disposing of accounts within 90 days of filing, an annual productivity rate of 235 per FTE is required.<sup>5</sup>

Average Account Filings	2,200
Average Fee Request Filings	1,600
Pending Accounts Backlog	<u>600</u>
Total Matters	4,400

Expenditure Plan. New FTEs will be recruited and hired according to the Courts' personnel policies.

Key Performance Indicators: With additional resources, baseline performance levels will improve. Success will be measured by compiling statistics on the time between filing and disposition of accounts and petitions for compensation.

***Enhanced Monitoring of Incapacitated Adults, \$56,000***  
***FTE Request: One Social Worker, JS-9/11/12***

Problem Statement. To enhance the protection of incapacitated adults and the quality of court supervision, a social worker is needed in the Intervention and Trusts Section of the Probate Division. The Intervention and Trusts Section of the Probate Division is responsible for the oversight and monitoring of nearly 2,000 incapacitated adults under court supervision. Guardians for these incapacitated adults must file reports with the Court twice a year outlining the status of their health and welfare. If any report contains information that the subject ward is being harmed or otherwise negatively impacted, a judge should be advised immediately. Currently, court staff reviews these reports for procedural compliance, but substantive review of the content of the reports is not possible because existing staff do not have the expertise required to make such assessments. A social worker who is professionally trained in the area of elder care

---

<sup>5</sup> Productivity and Efficiency Rates with current FTEs:  
4,400 matters/13 auditors = 338 Annual Productivity Rate at efficiency rates of 92% for requests for compensation and 48% for accounts.  
Estimated New Productivity and Efficiency Rates with requested FTEs:  
3750 matters/16 Auditors = 235 Annual Productivity Rate at efficiency rates of 95% for requests for compensation and 75% for accounts.  
Number reduced from 4400 to 3750 because plans are underway to automate the procedural review of approximately 650 annual requests for compensation from the Guardianship Fund administered by the Court pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 21-2060 (2001 ed.).



or geriatric care would enable the Probate Division to conduct a more thorough case review and report possible abuse promptly to the appropriate judges. The Social Worker also would communicate with the guardians, conservators, attorneys, and family members and could investigate, on behalf of the Court, in appropriate cases, including making site visits to wards in nursing homes, hospitals or wherever they are located.

Relationship to Courts Vision, Mission, and Goals. A Social Worker would provide substantive review of reports affecting the health and welfare of citizens under court supervision. This initiative is in alignment with the Courts' strategic goal of enhancing the administration of justice through the institution of case management plans that utilize best practices and time standards to ensure prompt case processing.

Relationship to Strategic Issues, Goals or Strategies. The Probate Division is responsible for reviewing guardianship reports and notifying the assigned judges of procedural irregularities. More in-depth review of the reports would better protect the health and welfare of adult wards and assist court appointees in resolving issues without judicial intervention.

Relationship to Existing Funding. The Division's base funding does not fund this position. The need for substantive review of guardian reports by a person qualified in the subject matter is based upon concern that clerical staff is not sufficiently qualified to recognize problems in the reports.

Methodology. The grade level for the Social Worker is in accordance with the Courts' classification policies.

Expenditure Plan. The Social Worker would be recruited and hired in accordance with the Courts' personnel policies.

Performance Indicators. Performance of the Social Worker will be measured by random supervisory reviews to ensure compliance with performance standards. The additional position will enable 100% substantive review of guardianship reports.

Table 3  
**PROBATE DIVISION**  
**New Positions Requested**

<b>Positions</b>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Salary</b>	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Total Personnel Costs</b>
Auditor	JS-12	3	201,000	48,000	249,000
Supervisory Auditor	JS-13	1	80,000	19,000	99,000
Social Worker	JS-9/11/12	1	45,000	11,000	56,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>326,000</b>	<b>78,000</b>	<b>404,000</b>

Table 4  
**PROBATE DIVISION**  
**Budget Authority by Object Class**

	<b>FY 2005 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2006 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2007 Request</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	2,830,000	2,939,000	3,413,000	474,000
12 - Benefits	676,000	705,000	819,000	114,000
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<b>3,506,000</b>	<b>3,644,000</b>	<b>4,232,000</b>	<b>588,000</b>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Services				
26 - Supplies & Materials	10,000	10,000	11,000	1,000
31 - Equipment	8,000	8,000	9,000	1,000
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<b>18,000</b>	<b>18,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>2,000</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,524,000</b>	<b>3,662,000</b>	<b>4,252,000</b>	<b>590,000</b>
FTE	45	45	50	5

Table 5  
**PROBATE DIVISION**  
**Detail Difference, FY 2006/2007**

<b>Object Class</b>	<b>Description of Request</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	Auditor	3	201,000	
	Supervisory Auditor	1	80,000	
	Social Worker	1	45,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	45	48,000	
	Current Positions COLA	45	100,000	
Subtotal				474,000
12 - Benefits	Auditor	3	48,000	
	Supervisory Auditor	1	19,000	
	Social Worker	1	11,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	45	12,000	
	Current Positions COLA	45	24,000	
Subtotal				114,000
21 - Travel, Transp. Of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction				
25 - Other Service				
26 - Supplies & Materials				1,000
31 – Equipment				1,000
Total				590,000

Table 7  
**PROBATE DIVISION**  
**Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment**

	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Enacted</b>	<b>2007 Request</b>
JS-3			
JS-4	2	2	2
JS-5	1	1	1
JS-6	3	3	1
JS-7	3	3	1
JS-8	5	5	8
JS-9	2	2	3
JS-10	2	2	2
JS-11	3	3	3
JS-12	16	16	19
JS-13	5	5	6
JS-14	2	2	2
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
CES	1	1	1
Total Salaries	2,830,000	2,939,000	3,368,00
Total	45	45	50

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT  
SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION**

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Obligations</u>
26	2,744,000	26	2,820,000	27	3,141,000	1	321,000

The Special Operations Division is a unique division among the operating divisions of the Superior Court that provides specialized services within its seven units to litigants, the general public, and court operations.

**Organizational Background**

The Special Operations Division consists of seven units, as follows:

1. The Jurors' Office maintains a listing of potential jurors, processes summons and qualifies jurors, obtains information on the size of the juror panel needed, randomly selects and disperses jurors, and selects and swears in grand jurors.
2. The Tax Office is responsible for the daily management of all tax appeals filed in the District of Columbia and for preparing and certifying these records on appeal.
3. The Appeals Coordinators' Office is responsible for the timely processing and service, record and transcript gathering, and record certifying of all cases on appeal.
4. The Superior Court Library houses law books, legal periodicals, and electronic research tools for the use of judges, attorneys, and court staff.
5. The Juror/Witness Child Care Center cares for children of jurors, witnesses, and other parties required to appear in court.
6. The Office of Court Interpreting Services provides foreign language and sign language interpreters to defendants and others for court hearings.
7. The Judge-in-Chambers is responsible for handling matters from every operating division of the Court that may involve the issuing of arrest, bench, and search warrants as well as the enforcement of foreign judgments.

**Division MAP Objectives**

- To provide qualified jurors to judges upon request for the purpose of voir dire in a timely manner 100% of the time by implementing procedures so that potential jurors can qualify themselves for jury service, defer their service dates and obtain pertinent information regarding their service via the Courts' website and informational kiosks.
- To accept, certify and prepare 100% of tax cases on appeal for review by the court according to time standards, quality assurance, and standard operating procedures in compliance with District of Columbia Official Code and Superior Court Tax Rules.
- To develop procedures, guidelines, and notices regarding the filing, payment and processing of all appeal cases in the Appeals Coordinator's Office. To prepare and forward all Notices

of Appeal filings and to certify and transmit appeal records and record indexes in which a Notice of Appeal has been received to the Court of Appeals timely (within 45 days of filing).

- To enhance informed judicial decision-making by maintaining a law library for judges, attorneys and court staff, which provides up-to-date materials on a broad range of subjects relevant to the administration of justice.
- To provide high quality child care services for jurors, witnesses, and other persons attending court proceedings by offering age appropriate play opportunities, supportive adult supervision, and a safe stress-free environment.
- To ensure access to court proceedings by non-English speaking and deaf/hearing-impaired persons by providing, upon request, certified foreign language and sign language interpreters for defendants and other parties for court hearings within ten minutes of receipt of a “ready” request from a courtroom at least 95% of the time.

### **Restructuring and Work Process Redesign**

Several restructuring efforts are underway in the Special Operations Division. The Jurors’ Office redesigned the content of its website to include much more information concerning the experience of serving on jury service. Also, an interactive website has been developed that allows jurors to complete a juror qualification form or defer their date of service online.

The Tax Office has been working with the Information Technology Division to implement the Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS) requirements for that office. In May 2004 the requirements were completed and the system became operational for the Tax Office. This system allows the Tax Office to manage their cases in a more efficient manner.

### **Workload Data**

In FY 2004, the Special Operations Division’s Jurors’ Office sent over 331,000 summonses to District of Columbia citizens to appear on juries; the Office of Court Interpreting Services received and fulfilled over 6,450 requests for courtroom interpreting services; the Tax Office heard and disposed of 161 tax petitions; and the Appeals Coordinators’ Office received 1,397 new appeals that were filed in various division offices. This figure reflects a 15% increase in the number of appeals filed in FY 2003. This office also certified approximately 1, 161 appeal records and supplemental records that were forwarded to the Court of Appeals as detailed in Table 4. Seven hundred and thirty seven children used the child-care center. Tables 1 through 6 provide performance data for fiscal years 2004 through 2007 for the Jurors’ Office, the Office of Court Interpreting Services, the Tax Office, the Appeals Coordinators Office, the library, and the child care center, respectively

Table 1  
**SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION**  
**Jurors' Office**  
**Performance Measurement Table**

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimated FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Output/ Activity	# of summons sent to jurors to serve on jury duty	Courts' Information Technology (IT) Division	331,965	338,604	345,376	352,283
Output/ Activity	Jurors qualified to serve on voir dire panels	IT Division	53,999	55,079	56,180	57,303
End Outcome	Judicial requests for voir dire panels met	Court's Research and Development Division	86%*	88%	90%	92%

Table 2  
**SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION**  
**Office of Court Interpreting Services**  
**Performance Measurement Table**  
**Requests for Spanish Language Interpretation**

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimated FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Input	Requests for interpreters	OCIS statistics	4844	5555	6118	6852
Output/ Activity	Interpreting services provided	OCIS statistics	4825	5528	6088	6818
End Outcome	Requests for interpreters met	OCIS statistics	99.6%	99.5%	99.5%	99.5%

Table 3  
**SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION**  
**Tax Office**  
**Performance Measurement Table**

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimated FY 2005	Projection PY 2006	Projection PY 2007
Input	Number of tax petitions filed	Court data	195	203	211	219
Output/ Activity	Number of cases prepared for hearing	Court data	592	615	639	664
End Outcome	Cases disposed	Court data	161	167	173	179
Productivity/ Efficiency	Cases disposed/cases file	Court data	70%	75%	80%	85%

Table 4  
**SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION**  
**Appeals Coordinator's Office**  
**Performance Measurement Table**

Type of Indicator	Key Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimated FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Input	Appeals filed	Monthly Statistical Report	1,397	1,400	1,410	1,420
Intermediate Outcome	Appeal records and supplemental records prepared	Staff worksheets	1,161	1,225	1,230	1,240
End Outcome	Appeal records certified when all transcripts are received	Monthly reports and staff worksheets	560	610	620	630

Table 5  
**SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION**  
**Library**  
**Performance Measurement Table**

Type of Indicator	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimated FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Output	Volumes available	Library staff data	23,100	23,200	23,300	23,400
Outcome	Patrons who used the library	Library staff data	8,510	8,850	9,204	9,608

Table 6  
**SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION**  
**Child Care Center**  
**Performance Measurement Table**

Type of Indicators	Performance Indicator	Data Source	Actual FY 2004	Estimated FY 2005	Projection FY 2006	Projection FY 2007
Input	Number of children visiting the center	Staff statistics	737	689	899	1040
Output/Activity	Number of caretakers available	Staff statistics	2	2	2	2
End Outcome	Average number of children cared for daily	Staff statistics	8	10	12	15
Productivity/Efficiency	Percentage of requests for care met (eligible children*)	Staff statistics	100%	100%	100%	100%

### **FY 2007 Request**

In FY 2007, the Courts request \$3,141,000 for Special Operations Division, an increase of \$321,000 (11%) above the FY 2006 Enacted level. The requested increase includes \$104,000 for books for the Law Library, \$70,000 for a Document Storage Filing System, \$43,000 for enhanced service in filing appeals, and \$104,000 for built-in increases.

### ***Library Book Budget - \$104,000***

Problem Statement. To facilitate well-informed judicial decision-making the Courts request funds to update the Court's law library budget to keep pace with the increasing cost of law books. Although the average increase in the cost of law books is approximately 15% per year, the Court's library budget has had only small inflationary increases since 2001. The Court uses electronic legal research service as much as possible, but periodicals, treatises, some reporters and indexes and the annual updates to them are indispensable to competent legal research. As it is, the library has had to discontinue ordering some books and is unable to update many treatises and periodicals, resulting in diminished service to judicial officers, attorneys, and the public who use the library.

Relationship to the Court's Strategic Issues, Goals, or Strategies. Up-to-date and complete information on the law is essential for the Courts to achieve their strategic goal of enhancing the administration of justice by ensuring informed judicial decision-making. This request particularly supports the Courts' Strategy 1.3.5 to provide adequate research and technology resources to judges.

Relationship to Division MAP Objectives. The request supports the Division's MAP objective of seeking a 15% annual budget increase for the law library to acquire and maintain up-to-date library materials and thereby achieve a high degree of customer satisfaction among judges, attorneys, and court staff who use the library by October, 2006.

Relationship to Existing Funding. An increase in the book budget would permit the library to update many of the periodicals that have been discontinued due to budget constraints. If these funds are not granted the library will not be able to provide timely and adequate services to its users.

Methodology. The increase is based on the current cost of books and the 15% annual increase in the cost of books.

Expenditure Plan. The funds would be used to purchase books and periodicals for the library, in accordance with the Courts' procurement policies.

Performance Indicators. Performance indicators would include the availability of books based on requests by users of the library that are met and customers expressing a high degree of satisfaction with library services and availability of materials.

### ***Electronic Document Storage Filing System for Juror Qualification Forms, \$70,000***

Problem Statement. The Jurors' Office staff is responsible for maintaining, searching, and storing over 200,000 juror qualification forms that are filed each year. The process is both time-consuming and labor intensive. The forms must be maintained for a minimum of two years.



To facilitate timely court proceedings the Courts request funds for an automated filing system to store and retrieve the 200,000 juror qualification forms the Court receives and processes each year. Juror qualification forms are sent to each District resident summoned to serve as a Superior Court juror to determine a potential juror's eligibility to serve. Once Jurors' Office staff enters data from the completed qualification form into the computer system, that form is manually filed according to the original date that the juror was scheduled to serve. If a potential juror raises an issue regarding his/her eligibility during the selection process in the courtroom, a judge may request the juror's original qualification form. Typically, when a judge makes a request for a juror qualification form, the form is needed immediately to avoid a delay in court proceeding. If a juror is serving on his original summons date, staff has to search all forms with that date (approximately 350-450 forms for each date) to locate the document, by name or bar code number. If a courtroom is waiting for the document, the court proceedings are delayed until the qualification form is located. With an electronic filing system, the forms could be searched by bar code number or date of service and could be located in seconds, realizing a significant efficiency enhancement and enhanced service to the litigants.

Relationship to Strategic Issues, Goals, or Strategies. Obtaining an electronic filing system would support the Court's Strategic Goal of improving court facilities and technology by providing technology that supports efficient and effective case processing, court management, and judicial decision-making. This request will also support the Courts' efforts to align employee performance with organizational goals by providing staff with a fair and timely assessment of their performance each year.

Relationship to Division MAP Objectives. This request would support the Division's objective to streamline jury panel services the Jurors' Office delivers to Criminal and Civil courtrooms by eliminating delays due to manual searches for juror qualification forms.

Relationship to Existing Funding. Currently there are no funds available in the division budget to cover the purchase of this technology. If funds are not provided, the staff in the Jurors' Office will be forced to rely on manual methods to retrieve vital information.

Methodology. The Division researched available technology and found a system that meets its needs for storing and retrieving juror qualification forms. The requested amount reflects the cost needed to purchase this item.

Expenditure Plan. Funds would be used to purchase the system through the Court's procurement system.

Performance Indicators. Performance indicators include the time needed to retrieve qualification forms as well as the staff response time to telephone inquiries and other customer service tasks due to the elimination of time-consuming manual searches for qualification forms.

***Enhancing Service in the Appeals Coordinator's Office, \$43,000***  
***FTE Request - Deputy Clerk I, JS-6, \$43,000***

**Problem Statement.** To enhance public service by streamlining the appeals process; the Courts are establishing a “one stop shopping” center in the Appeals Coordinators Office. Previously, notices of appeals were filed in each of the operating divisions of Superior Court (e.g., Criminal Division, Family Court, Civil Division, Probate Division), and then forwarded to the Appeals Coordinators Office for processing. Persons were then required to go to the Finance Office to pay the filing fee. Under the new system, the process is centralized in that the filing and payments are handled in the same office. To better serve the public, an additional staff person is needed to respond to the increased workload, including responding to inquiries, filing and reviewing Notices of Appeals and processing payments. The lack of sufficient staffing will result in delays in customer service.

**Relationship to Strategic Issues, Goals, or Strategies.** Providing a Single Point of Filing will support the Courts’ Strategic Issue 2: Broadening Access to Justice and Service to the Public. To facilitate timely and efficient processing of all appeals filed in the Appeals Coordinator’s Office, it is important that sufficient staffing be provided.

**Relationship to Division MAP Objectives.** This request would support the Division’s MAP for the timely and effective filing, processing and payment for Notices of Appeal (NOA) by establishing a Single Point of Filing for all NOAs. This also supports the division’s MAP which involves the tracking of all *In Forma Pauperis* (IFP) transcript orders that have been forwarded to judges for review. Additional staff will enhance the timely preparation of the appeal record and its submission to the Court of Appeals for review, calendaring, and disposition.

**Relationship to Existing Funding.** Funds are currently not available to cover an additional Deputy Clerk position in the Appeals Coordinator’s Office.

**Methodology.** The grade level and salary for the requested FTE was classified pursuant to the Courts’ Personnel Policies.

**Expenditure Plan.** The recruitment and selection process will be conducted in accordance with the Courts’ personnel policies.

**Performance Indicators.** Performance indicators will include the number of appeal cases processed timely, the number of appeal records certified timely to the Court of Appeals and an increased level of customer satisfaction with the single point of filing process.

Table 7  
**Special Operations Division  
New Positions Requested**

<b>Positions</b>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Annual Salary</b>	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Total Personnel Costs</b>
Deputy Clerk I-Appeals Coordinators Office	JS-6	1	35,000	8,000	43,000

Table 8  
**SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION**  
**Budget Authority by Object Class**

	<b>FY 2005 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2006 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2007 Request</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	1,500,000	1,551,000	1,652,000	101,000
12 - Benefits	360,000	372,000	396,000	24,000
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<b>1,860,000</b>	<b>1,923,000</b>	<b>2,048,000</b>	<b>125,000</b>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	131,000	133,000	136,000	3,000
25 - Other Services	539,000	547,000	630,000	83,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	209,000	212,000	321,000	109,000
31 - Equipment	5,000	5,000	6,000	1,000
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<b>884,000</b>	<b>897,000</b>	<b>1,093,000</b>	<b>196,000</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,744,000</b>	<b>2,820,000</b>	<b>3,141,000</b>	<b>321,000</b>
FTE	26	26	27	1

Table 9  
**SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION**  
**Detail, Difference FY 2006/ 2007**

<b>Object Class</b>	<b>Description of Request</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	Deputy Clerk -Appeals Coordinators Office	1	35,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	27	13,000	
	Current Positions COLA	27	53,000	
Subtotal				101,000
12 - Benefits	Deputy Clerk -Appeals Coordinators Office	1	8,000	
	Current Positions WIGS	27	3,000	
	Current Positions WIGS/COLA	27	13,000	
Subtotal				24,000
21 - Travel, Transp. Of Persons				
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities				
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			3,000
25 - Other Services	Document Storage Filing System		70,000	
	Built-in		13,000	
Subtotal				83,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Library Books		104,000	
	Built-in		5,000	
Subtotal				109,000
31 - Equipment Total	Built-in			1,000

Total				321,000
-------	--	--	--	---------

Table 10  
**SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION**  
**Detail of Full-Time Equivalent Employment**

	2005 Actual	2006 Enacted	2007 Request
JS-3			
JS-4			
JS-5			
JS-6	1	1	2
JS-7	5	5	5
JS-8	6	6	6
JS-9	5	5	5
JS-10			
JS-11	2	2	2
JS-12	4	4	4
JS-13	2	2	2
JS-14			
JS-15	1	1	1
JS-16			
JS-17			
JS Salaries	1,500,000	1,551,000	1,652,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>27</b>

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPERIOR COURT  
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT**

<u>FY 2005 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2006 Enacted</u>		<u>FY 2007 Request</u>		<u>Difference FY 2006/2007</u>	
FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations	FTE	Obligations
-	10,772,000	-	10,922,000	-	11,188,000	-	266,000

To capitalize on centralization of function and economies of scale, a variety of enterprise wide expenses are consolidated in a “management account.” This account provides support for procurement and contract services; safety and health services; and general administrative support in the following areas: space, telecommunications, office supplies, printing and reproduction, mail payments to the U.S. Postal Service, payment for juror and witness services, and publications. The fund also includes replacement of equipment.

**FY2007 Request**

In FY 2007, the Courts request \$11,188,000 for the Management Account, an increase of \$266,000 or 2.4%, above the FY 2006 Enacted level. The requested increase consists entirely of built-in costs.

Table 1  
**MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT  
Budget Authority by Object Class**

	<b>FY 2005 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2006 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2007 Request</b>	<b>Difference FY 2006/2007</b>
11 - Compensation	280,000	300,000	310,000	10,000
12 - Benefits				
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<i>280,000</i>	<i>300,000</i>	<i>310,000</i>	<i>10,000</i>
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	280,000	284,000	291,000	7,000
22 - Transportation of Things	9,000	9,000	9,000	0
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	4,973,000	4,111,000	4,210,000	99,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	277,000	281,000	288,000	7,000
25 - Other Services	4,352,000	5,327,000	5,455,000	128,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	409,000	415,000	425,000	10,000
31 - Equipment	192,000	195,000	200,000	5,000
<b>Subtotal Non Personnel Cost</b>	<i>10,492,000</i>	<i>10,622,000</i>	<i>10,878,000</i>	<i>256,000</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10,772,000</b>	<b>10,922,000</b>	<b>11,188,000</b>	<b>266,000</b>
FTE	0	0	0	0

Table 2  
**Management Account**  
**Detail, Difference FY 2006/2007**

<b>Object Class</b>	<b>Description of Request</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Difference</b>
11 - Compensation	Built-in			10,000
12 - Benefits				
21 - Travel, Transp. of Persons	Built-in			7,000
22 - Transportation of Things				
23 - Rent, Commun. & Utilities	Built-in			99,000
24 - Printing & Reproduction	Built-in			7,000
25 - Other Service	Built-in			128,000
26 - Supplies & Materials	Built-in			10,000
31 - Equipment				5,000
Total				266,000